



LIBRARY OF CONGRESS.

Chap. BS 1171  
Copyright No.

Shelf C75

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.





# RESULTS OF HIGHER CRITICISM

AS APPLIED TO THE

OLD TESTAMENT

BY

W. S. CROWE, D.D.

Author of "Phases of Religion in America," Etc.

WITH AN INTRODUCTION BY

H. W. THOMAS, D.D.



H9646 - 2

NEWARK, N. J.  
Printed by Ward & Tichenor.  
1894.

B51171  
C75

Copyright, 1894,  
by W. S. CROWE

*To the*  
HON. PERRY HANNAH  
THE WISE AND HELPFUL FRIEND  
*of my early manhood*



## P R E F A C E

The aim of this book is merely to sum up the more general results at which the critics have arrived in their study of the Old Testament, and present those results in popular form for busy people. Where authorities disagree, those have been followed which pursue the scientific method of historical research most consistently.

The work has been done hurriedly and at intervals, in the midst of many other labors, and its defects will be apparent—not more apparent, it is hoped, than the purpose to help its readers into a clearer religious light and give them a deeper confidence in the revelation which God makes to the developing moral sense of humanity.

W. S. C.

NEWARK, N. J., November, 1894.



## INTRODUCTION

Of the many toilers in the field of really constructive and enduring religious thought, the Rev. Dr. W. S. Crowe is one of the most able, tireless, candid and courageous. Naturally, and almost necessarily, much that he says in trying to clear away the old errors and prepare the way for the new, the larger and better faith of the true, may seem to some destruction; but his effort is not to "destroy, but to fulfil;" not to take away faith, but to free faith from the accretions of error that have been and are the prolific sources of unfaith. He has faith in the truth; is not afraid to trust truth to the rational and moral consciousness of mankind; clearly sees the facts of history and literature; gives them as he finds them; is not the retained attorney of a sect, or a school of thought or theology, but the fearless advocate of the faith and religion of a world.

The right of one in a denomination to thus think and write, may be questioned by some, and even criticised, but to those who would minister most deeply and helpfully to the present needs of our transitional and unsettled time, the supreme question in all cases must be, not what has been thought to be truth, but what is truth. The truth is that which is; error is that which is not. And only the true can stand the test of the ages.

When, some twenty-five years ago, Bishop Colenso ventured to question the historic accuracy of certain statements in the Old Testament, the Orthodox churches of England and our own country were frightened, fearing that the foundations of faith were endangered, or were being hopelessly undermined. But such a fear was a poor answer to the facts he presented, and the larger-minded Dean Stanley confessed that the difference between himself and 'Dr. Colenso, who was on trial for heresy, was largely in the fact that the Dean dwelt upon the excellencies of the Bible, while the Bishop felt called upon to criticise its defects.

Nor is it difficult to understand why such criticism should

have created alarm and disturbance. The Bible had long been accepted as the infallible word of God, and all of its sixty-six books as equally inspired and authoritative. It was this infallible Book that the Protestant church put over against the infallible Church of the Catholics, and each accepted its own authority as final; that is, took authority for truth, instead of truth for authority.

Fifty, yes, thirty years ago, belief in the plenary inspiration and the inerrant infallibility of the Bible, was just as sacred as was belief in the existence and character of God, and in one sense more sacred; for Orthodox theologians did venture to discuss the Divine existence and attributes, but they accepted everything in the Bible without question. And even now, the Presbyterian church is quite free to discuss the peculiar doctrines of Calvin, and to propose a revision of its Creed, but when Dr. Briggs and Prof. Smith dared question the old doctrine of inspiration and the infallibility of the Bible, these learned men were tried for heresy, and expelled from the ministry of that church.

But the questions and facts of the Higher Criticism cannot be answered or settled, nor even long delayed, by such ecclesiastical decisions. The age of Church authority is happily past; henceforth the one question must be, what is true? And the church or the faith that cannot fearlessly brave that ordeal, must fall back, must find its place in the rear and not in the front ranks of these wonderful years of rational progress.

Nor is the fear well founded, that the great changes in the living thought of our time will work the destruction or even do injury to faith. Old forms of faith must change and give place to the new, but out of all will come forth the greater and better faith of the future. This has been the history of religious thought in the past. The new astronomy destroyed faith in the old, but the now accepted facts of the Copernican theory of the universe have made possible a larger and surer faith than was possible to the minds that were so long shut up to the false and little geocentric theory of the Ptolemaic views of the heavens and the earth. And the same has been true of the longer periods of geology that came to dispute the old six-day theory of the creation. And the still later doctrine of evo-

lution, that at first was opposed as the enemy of faith—is not yet welcomed by all—is enlarging the vision, and emphasizing the fact of the immanency, the continued presence and nearness of the Divine in the laws of nature and in the reason and conscience of man, thence making faith more near and real than ever before; for it is the faith of that which is, and rests upon the eternal and progressive order of the Divine, and not a faith that tries to rest upon the supposed but unverifiable disturbances of that order. The supernatural is coming to be seen not as the unnatural, but as the higher natural; the unnatural is disappearing from the world of religion, and in its place is coming the surer and larger faith in the higher natural.

In the light of the evolution of man and religion, the Higher Criticism is finding the place and order and progressive teaching of the books of the Old Testament, and the result is that the Bible is becoming a new book, a wonderful and sacred history and literature of the long past; and none the less sacred because it is a history and a literature, and as such reveals the progressive life and the imperfections and errors of its time and of its generally unknown authors. And it is not strange that this higher process should replace the order and dates of many books in the Old Testament; but in the new historical setting or arrangement, the real meaning and relevancy of these books to the conditions and needs of the times in which they were written becomes more, and often most strikingly apparent.

It is in this that the work of Dr. Crowe has its unique value. In the larger works of Prof. Robertson Smith, Drs. Kuenen and Driver, and the "Bible for Learners," the same ground has been gone over; but in none of these is there the masterly grouping of facts, the vivid historic imagination, the originality of conception and the practical adaptation to the thought and need of the present, that are the marked characteristics and charm of these pages by Dr. Crowe. He has accomplished the very difficult task of popularizing, and at the same time preserving the full strength and dignity of a great and serious study, that to other authors is so largely a dry detail of dates and the growth and use of words. These are essentials in the science of the Higher Criticism; nor are they wanting in this most excellent work, but in their powerful and artistic presenta-

tion they have the freshness and interest of a history of a near yesterday, and make one feel that he is living in the great realities of the long ago.

Nor is this all: the study of these pages will lead to the new study of the Bible, and to a wiser appreciation and profounder realization of its great spiritual truths as revealed in the unfolding religious consciousness of the world.

H. W. THOMAS.

## CONTENTS

### CHAPTER I

<i>Back to the Beginning :</i>	PAGE
Epochs in the history and development of the Bible—the earliest writing—the original literature—hero stories, legends and myths.....	I

### CHAPTER II

<i>Early Hebrew History :</i>	
Primitive traditions—historic outlines—literature dependent on history—the tribal period—Hebrew ignorance of Egypt—the literature of the tribal period—“Jacob’s Blessing” and “The Covenant.”.....	II

### CHAPTER III

<i>The National Period :</i>	
How the tribes became a nation—Saul, the giant—David, not the psalmist—intellectual development in time of war—Solomon, the unwise—his weakness as a statesman—the squandering of energy in untimely architecture—the nation’s crisis—the failure—political degeneracy—religion and literature of the national period—the beginning of the priesthood—“The Wars of the Lord” and “The Book of Jasher”—religious development—characteristics of the ancient nations.....	18

### CHAPTER IV

<i>Israel and Judah :</i>	
The new ideal—the people’s conception of “manifest destiny”—prophets and prophecy—what prophecy is not and what it is—theological prophets—the epoch of reform—how a new moral sense creates literary activity—the great eighth century B. C.—Amos, Hosea, the First Isaiah, Micah—false readings—drama, the song of Solomon—wisdom literature—the first collection of Proverbs—poetry—the two Decalogues—the Hexateuch—double authorship—the prophet historian—other histories.....	33

## CHAPTER V

*Judah :*

PAGE

- The destruction of Israel—last of the great ethical prophets—sudden development of the Jewish priesthood—centralization of ecclesiastical power under Hezekiah—Josiah's great stratagem for unifying the church—the book of Deuteronomy—the occasion of other books, Zephaniah, Nahum—second collection of Proverbs—Jeremiah, the priest-prophet—conflicting theories of providence, the old prophetic theory, the new priestly theory, the theory of the book of Job ..... 65

## CHAPTER VI

*In Captivity :*

- Difference between heathen and Christian treatment of the religion of conquered peoples—the priests of the exile as organizers—what became of the Ten Tribes—the adoption of ceremonial exclusiveness—The Law of holiness as a political measure—a fragment of Zechariah—Ezekiel, the Startling—Lamentations—“The Suffering Servant”—a few psalms—Obadiah—Judges—Samuel—Kings—a shout of triumph—Cyrus, the Deliverer—three reasons for his kindness to the Jews ..... 79

## CHAPTER VII

*The Home-Coming:*

- Conditions of the return—literature of the return, fragments of Isaiah, part of Zechariah, Haggai, Joel—the sufferer's pride—who and what the Samaritans were..... 92

## CHAPTER VIII

*The Law :*

- The spirit and the work of the Jews who remained in Babylon—the literary creation of The Tabernacle for a priestly purpose—the practice of dating books backward and claiming fictitious authorship—Ezra in Jerusalem—his cruel but necessary decree against intermarriage with heathen—Nehemiah in Jerusalem—his promulgation of the so-called Law of Moses—the writing of various books into a pentateuch—memoirs of Ezra and Nehemiah—Malachi—

	PAGE
Novels, Ruth and Jonah, against priestly assumption—the conservative era—Chronicles—Psalms, the hymn-book of the rejuvenated second temple.....	96

### CHAPTER IX

*Greek Influence:*

Growing intelligence and decaying morality—Esther and Ecclesiastes .....	115
--	-----

### CHAPTER X

*The Jewish Reformation:*

A sketch of Jewish history from 332 B. C. to 160 B. C.—the heathenizing of Judaism—the new patriotism—Judas Maccabæus—the book of Daniel—the excuse for literary forgery—recapitulation of the dates of Old Testament writings .....	120
--	-----

### CHAPTER XI

*The Critics:*

In Scotland, Lord Gifford's contribution to theological progress—in England, the liberalism of conservative Oxford—the work of Dr. Briggs and Dr. Salmond—in Holland and Germany, Kuenen and Wellhausen—in America, tardy but at last awake—the purpose of the critics.....	131
---	-----

### CHAPTER XII

*Incidental Results:*

Incidental results always greater than direct results—a consideration of traditional theories about the Bible; the “all or none” theory; the “one book” theory; the “miraculous revelation” theory; the “miraculous prophecy” theory; the “miraculous history” theory—the new appreciation of the Bible—its sublime power of moral conviction—the true idea of revelation; the vision accorded to the moral sense—the difference between a necessary evil and the eternal right—inspiration—providence—the issue—the tyranny of texts—the ground of hatred and persecution—what Higher Criticism is good for .....	141
--	-----







*CHAPTER I.*

## BACK TO THE BEGINNING.

We shall need to go about our work as geologists do—passing down through stratum after stratum until we reach the primitive rock. A child, looking out upon the world, imagines that it came from the Creator's hand just as it is now. The seas and mountains and rivers, and even the forests, he supposes, are just as God spake them into being. With a very little knowledge the child comes to understand that our forests—all forests—are a modern growth. When he studies back to the glacial period, he finds that our rivers and lakes are things of comparatively recent origin. When he gets a little deeper into this great book of the rocks, he finds that our continents and oceans are not the original continents and oceans. Continents have been thrown up and worn away, oceans have been ploughed out and filled, their forms and locations many times changed. The heights of our highest hills have been at the bottom of the sea. Going still further back, the student comes upon a time, before there were any mountains or any seas, when the earth was a mass of molten stuffs, like a great fiery paste. We may pause here and call that the original earth.

Looking upon the Bible, children and grown children imagine that it came from the hand of God in its present shape. They suppose that its various books, divided into chapters and verses, with headings and punctuation marks, printed in the English language ; the books set in the order and dated and authors given, as we now have them, and bound in a single volume—that this Bible which we handle is the original Bible. Now, let us dig down through the history of this great old book and see what we find along the way and what we have left for a beginning.

A good reference book, for these particular facts, is the Rev.

John W. Chadwick's "*Bible of To-Day*." Mr. Chadwick's well-known scholarship, if no other authority were at hand, would relieve my hesitancy in making the following statements.

The Bible, as we now have it, is only 232 years old. The dates of many of the books were put on by Archbishop Usher, in the year 1660. That is our first halting place. There has never been a hotter controversy than has raged about the question of dates. Men have struggled for Usher's dates, as if Paul and Isaiah and Moses themselves had put on the figures. Usher's chronology is little better than a pious guess-work.

We travel back forty-nine years farther to another halting place. The year is 1611. The fact is our authorized version. The spirit of the enterprise is James I. of England. Under the direction of James the bishops put on these chapter headings and these running titles of the margins. Turn, for instance, to chapter xlix. of Isaiah and read this heading: "Christ, being sent to the Jews, complaineth of them. He is sent to the Gentiles with gracious promises." Look at the top of the page and see this running title: "Christ sent to the Gentiles," and on the next page: "An exhortation to trust in Christ." For these 281 years the children and grown children of Protestant Christendom have read those headings and titles and have considered them a part of the Bible: if not original, at least as containing the original import and meaning of Isaiah. We should not be much farther from the truth if we Americans should make a new authorized version and should put a heading to Isaiah xlix. on this wise: "Washington, being sent to the English, complaineth of them. He is sent to the Americans with gracious promises." Read the third verse of that chapter and you will see what Isaiah means. Jehovah is made to say: "Thou art my servant, O Israel (the nation of Israel), in whom I will be glorified." "Israel" does not mean "Christ" any more than it means "Washington." For 281 years the children have read these headings and supposed they were an explanation of the chapters. It is a great advantage to get back of them and read the Bible without their absurd commentary.

Now, let us go back sixty years further to another halting station. The year is 1551. The genius is Robert Stephens (or

Estienne, as is the name in French), a printer of Paris, a rigid Calvinist. The momentous fact is the printing of the Bible, or part of it, with the present division of chapters and verses. "This division into verses," says Chadwick, "has been a fruitful source of textual polemics, resulting in bad blood and worse theology."

Another short journey takes us back to the fourteenth century, when people began to say "The Bible." The simple fact that we call this collection of books "The Bible," as if it were one book, and not a collection of books, is a very important fact; a fact that has been fruitful of misunderstanding. We naturally think of one book as having one author, or one directing genius. When children understand that between the first and last writing intervened a thousand years they know, of course, that one man was not the author; but if it is one book it must somehow have been the work of one mind. Simply because we call it The Bible, children conclude that all its parts must agree—that a continuous meaning runs all through it—that its purposes and doctrines must have unity of design.

Prior to the fourteenth century it was not called The Bible. It was not thought of as one book. They did not say *Ton Biblion*, but *Ta Biblia*—the books. And prior to the fifth century these were not called books at all, but writings—Hebrew and Christian writings. It makes a vast difference to the average man whether he is reading The Bible or whether he is reading Hebrew and Christian writings. Turn your thoughts inward to your own childish conception of things, and you will see what I mean.

Another important date—one of the most important in relation to the Hebrew writings, may be set down approximately as the year 600. The interesting fact in that connection is what scholars know as the Massora. What is the Massora? The word means tradition. What does the tradition refer to? To the pronunciation, punctuation and vowels of Hebrew writing. Hebrew writing, before the time of which I speak, about 600 A. D., had no punctuation marks and no vowels. Its alphabet consisted of nothing but consonants. It had no capital letters and no word spaces.

Suppose you try the experiment of writing a few sentences

without vowels, without word spaces, without capitals and without punctuations—just placing the consonants of the words, one after the other, the same space between each two letters, until you fill a page. Do you think anybody could read it? Well, that is all that Hebrew writing for fifteen centuries afforded. Take such a sentence as “God is love.” It would be written “g d s l v.” If you had simply those consonants you would be at a great loss what to make of them. You might put in one set of vowels and it would read, “aged slave.” With other vowels it will read “good salve.” You can readily see that an entire book written thus, of solid consonants, would be capable of more interpretations than a party platform or a candidate’s letter of acceptance.

How did the Hebrews keep the pronunciation and the division into sentences at all? Simply by reading aloud and practically committing, from generation to generation. Punctuation is a very important thing. You recall the old story of that member of Commons who had accused another member of lying. A resolution was passed obliging him to make public apology; which he did in this wise: “I said the gentleman lied, it is true; and I am sorry for it.” But when the apology appeared next morning, in print, the comma after the word lied had been changed to a period, and the following letter duly capitalized. Then it was no apology: “I said the gentleman lied. It is true; and I am sorry for it.”

When the entire meaning of books was carried along thus for a thousand or fifteen hundred years in the memory, you can see the liability to mistake. That memory, “tradition,” Masora, was written into the Bible about the year 600.

The most important word in the Hebrew language—their name for God—is still in dispute. It was written j h v h. Through motives of reverence it was seldom pronounced, and the pronunciation was lost. Whether it should be Jehovah, Jahaveh or Jahveh, is still an unsettled problem. Most scholars incline to the last spelling.

You see that a Bible of the olden time did not look much like ours. Of course it was not printed or bound. It was a collection of parchment rolls. In very ancient times the writing was on ox-hides. The surface of the leather was

scratched with an iron stylus and ink was let into the scraches. The book of Isaiah, for instance, written on half a dozen ox-hides, those hides tied together with thongs, would make a roll, like a roll of hall-carpet, five feet long, and the size of a man's body. There were no running titles, no chapter headings, no division into chapters or verses, no spacing between words, no capital letters, no punctuation marks and no vowels.

In all the world there were but a few copies of any book. Those copies were kept in the temple and the synagogues. Few people read them. The priests re-wrote them as the old hides became worn or musty, and we shall never know how much of the original was left out, changed, or what additions were made in the course of so many centuries.

Now, as we travel back from the Massoretic period, let us see what we lose on the way.

Of course, when we reach the time of Christ, we have lost the entire New Testament.

We go back to the beginning of the Maccabæn war—166 B. C.—and the entire Apocrypha, Daniel, a few Psalms, have dropped out.

We go back to the conquest of Palestine by Alexander—332 B. C.—and Ecclesiastes, Esther, Chronicles, more Psalms, have dropped out.

We go back to the advent of Ezra—458 B. C.—and Ruth, Jonah, Ezra, Nehemiah, Malachi, one-third of the Proverbs, the great body of the Psalms, have dropped out.

We go back to the destruction of Jerusalem—586 B. C.—and Joel, Haggai, Obadiah, Lamentations, Ezekiel, First and Second Kings, First and Second Samuel, Judges, Leviticus, about half of Genesis and Exodus and Numbers and Joshua, large portions of Jeremiah and Zechariah and Isaiah, some of the few remaining Psalms, have dropped out.

We go back to the deportation of the Ten Tribes—721 B. C.—and the remainder of Jeremiah, more Psalms, Job, Nahum, Zephaniah, another third of Proverbs, Deuteronomy, Micah, other portions of Isaiah, have dropped out.

What of our Bible did Israel (Ten Tribes) ever see? Hosea, Amos, Song of Solomon, about half of Isaiah, one-third of Proverbs, a few chapters of Zechariah, the story parts of Gen-

esis and Exodus and Numbers and Joshua, the Decalogue, Jacob's Blessing, and the Covenant ; and all of these, except the last three, were new ; the oldest of them not having been written more than fifty years when Israel was destroyed by the Assyrians.

When we get back to 800 B. C., there was probably nothing, as it stands in our Bible to-day, except the Decalogue, the Covenant, and Jacob's Blessing—five short chapters. You must remember that 800 B. C., for any of the Mediterranean nations outside of Egypt, is a very ancient date. That was twenty-four years before the first Great Olympiad in Greece, which was held in 776, and is the oldest reliable date in Greek history. It was forty-seven years before the reputed founding of the city of Rome, which, according to the Roman historian, Varro, took place in the year 753 B. C. All that ancient history of Rome, however, is lost in the impenetrable fog of tradition.

When we ask a date for any writing of the Mediterranean world, outside of Egypt, prior to 800 B. C., we are making a heavy demand. Herodotus claims that Homer himself was not more than fifty years earlier, but that date must be greatly revised. Dr. William Smith inclines to the idea that Homer composed his poems very near the time of the first Great Olympiad. Mahaffy is disposed to bring Homer down almost to the year 700.

Did the pre-Homeric poets and story-tellers write, or simply compose and recite their works ? That is a still graver question. What I have said about ancient Hebrew writing applies almost entirely to ancient Greek. It was without spaces and punctuations. Very little, indeed, was written. It was composed and recited. The Greeks actually became a literary people before they had books. Poems, legends, stories of great men and great events were put in form and recited until multitudes committed them. In the olden times there were professional reciters—Rhapsodists, they were called—who traveled from city to city and from village to village, reciting the compositions of the bards in temples or in the markets or on the public squares—wherever a crowd of listeners would gather. That was the ancient cir-

culating library. Parchments were few and expensive. Not one person in ten thousand could write or read, but they could all listen and remember. At the Olympiads the great authors first recited their own productions. The professional reciters committed the poem or story, and then went over the land popularizing the new composition.

Now, we must understand, once for all, that the ancient Hebrew literature was produced and popularized in the same way. Psalms, historic stories, dramas, legends, prophetic utterances were composed and recited. After a while this and that great composition were written and the writing kept in the temple, just as Greek poems were finally written out and preserved in the temple at Olympia. The Hebrews, like the Greeks, had a considerable literature in memory while yet they had almost no writing, and while the little writing they had served only to correct the memory of the priests and rhapsodists.

When you get back to the year 800 B. C., you are practically at the beginning of written literature, for the Mediterranean world, outside of Egypt. It may possibly be that among the Hebrews a few scraps were written earlier. Many scholars incline to the idea that the *Ten Commandments*, in some primitive form, that *The Covenant* which we have in Exodus xxi., xxii., and up to the nineteenth verse of xxiii.; and that *Jacob's Blessing*, which we have in Genesis xliv., were written much earlier. Other scholars are in serious doubt of it. That these old fragments, and much besides, were composed and recited and well known long before the date 800 B.C., there is no doubt.

Now, if we can, let us get at the meaning of that "much besides." To put it plainly, what literature did the Hebrews have, in memory, before 800 B. C.? That is what I mean by their original literature.

What kind of a literature do people, who do not read, carry along in their memories? Statistics? No. Scientific treatises? No. Careful historic accounts with verified facts and dates? No. Philosophical works? No. Anything of the nature of a plain prose statement? No. They carry along the kind of literature that is easy to remember. What is easy to

remember? Stories, songs, proverbs, legends, myths. Well, these are the things that every original literature consists of. Go down among the negroes and the poor whites of the South and you will find more proverbs and quaint sayings, ten times over, than you or I ever found use for. Go into the interior districts of Ireland or Germany, and you will find more hob-goblin stories, more fairy and brownie and spook literature, than you ever read in books. Fiske and Baring-Gould and others have rendered the cultured world a great service in gathering up these myths, this curious folk-lore, from the country sides, and giving the mass of it in book-form. Schoolcraft and Longfellow did a great service in gathering up the myths and legends of the American Indians. Hiawatha is simply their memory literature put in cultured form. William Black and G. W. Cable, in their stories of Southern life, have done much of the same for the negroes and creoles. Walter Scott did the same in "Rob Roy" and "Lady of the Lake," for Scotland. Chaucer did the same, in "Canterbury Tales," for primitive England. Boccaccio did the same, for the baser kind of stuff, in old Italian life. "The Lives of the Saints," so beloved in the Catholic church, is the same kind of a gathering up of exaggerated religious stories, as those stories floated down the ages of ignorance. "The Arabian Nights" is but a collection of these ancient, popular stories. The poems of Homer himself, in the main, are nothing more nor different. Get Bulfinch's "Age of Fable," and you have the Homeric stories resolved back into their primitive form.

Proverbs, "sayings," songs like those of Moses and Miriam and Deborah, the sun myth like that put into the form of the Samson story—such things were easily remembered. The Ten Commands and the famous traditions about the tables of stone on which they were written, the covenant and Jacob's blessing—these are religious things which a primitive people keep well in mind.

Now, for the old Hebrew, unwritten history. If you will take up the historic books of the Old Testament, and read them with this key in your thoughts, their pages are unlocked. You will immediately appreciate that they consist of a series of short, popular, wonder-stories of the old heroes. Just such

stories as you have in Homer, with a germ foundation in fact, but which have grown from age to age until every story contains a wonder, a miracle. It is the miracle in it which makes it easy for the common people to remember.

Suppose we had no written literature, no books, how do you think we should preserve the main facts of our American history? We could not remember the thousands of names of all the governors and generals and poets and story-tellers and teachers and financiers. We should do just as people always did. We should remember the names of the great heroes, and we should give them credit for everything their generation accomplished. All that a colony did in forty years, all that an army did in ten years, we should attribute to one man; and, of course, we should make him a miraculous man to do so much.

Out of the primeval age would loom one great figure—Columbus—and we should give him credit for everything that Amerigo and the Cabots and Magellan and Cortes and Pizarro, and fifty other discoverers and conquerors, brought to pass. We should make him live a hundred years. We should give him magic ships and a power of quelling storms and slaying multitudes with his god-like word. Miles Standish, perhaps, would be the only New Englander of half a century that we would recall. We should have him crossing the ocean on dry land, with sun and moon standing still while he slaughtered more Indians. George Washington's hatchet would have grown to a hammer of Thor with which he knocked down half the primeval forest of Virginia and slew the English army single-handed. All the good stories of these four centuries would be attributed to Lincoln, just as all the Hebrew proverbs of ten centuries were attributed to Solomon. All the songs and hymns of our hundreds of writers would be credited to Longfellow, perhaps, just as all the Psalms are sometimes called David's.

In this way the Hebrews kept the simple facts of their history—imbedded in the wonder and childish charm of hero-stories. The Hebrews escaped from Egypt, where they had been slaves. How, the later generations quite forgot. One great name they remembered—the name of Moses. Every-

thing was attributed to him. Wonder-stories were woven about him—his birth, the burning bush, his Ten Commands received from God on Sinai, his strange death, his active life of 120 years. Then we have the stories of Joshua, Gideon, Jephthah, Deborah, Samuel, Saul, David, Solomon—hero-stories, every one, in which the work of an entire people for one or two generations is attributed to the hero. Imagination had full play. Legend and myth were woven into the narrative and dates forgotten. The wonder, the miracle, in every case, helped the people to remember the simple historic fact at the heart of the story. Canaan was conquered, the tribes were consolidated into a nation, the temple was built, the Ten Commands were composed. The toilsome history of these events has been lost and the events are floated down to us in their clouds of tradition.

*CHAPTER II.*

## EARLY HEBREW HISTORY.

Hebrew history begins with the exodus from Egypt. Back of that is obscure and irresponsible tradition. The date of the exodus must be brought forward nearly two centuries. The best authorities place it about 1320 B.C. What is commonly called the "forty years in the wilderness" is a literary production rather than an authentic account. Whether the forty years have not dwindled to less than three is a grave question. The story of the conquest of Canaan is also, in very large degree, literary. Authentic history finds the Israelite tribes in Canaan; finds that they had come from Egyptian slavery; finds that their remote ancestors had probably been Canaanites. That is about all that the scholars have found concerning the origin of the Hebrew people.

The first period of Hebrew history extends from the exodus, 1320, to the beginning of national unity under Saul; or to the beginning of Saul's wars, which culminated in national unity; to which the date of 1100 B.C. would not be far out of the way. These two hundred and twenty years constitute the tribal period. Very little is known of the detailed history of that time. The scanty sources of knowledge are sufficient, however, to give a tolerably clear outline of the beliefs and customs of that primitive age.

The second period of the history includes those stirring events of conquest, and king-making, and nation-building, and temple-building, from the beginning of Saul's career to the division of Solomon's kingdom—about 975 B.C. Politically speaking, this was the great age, though it ended in decadence.

The third period covers the time of the two kingdoms, "Israel" and "Judah," from 975 to 721 B.C., when "Israel" was destroyed, and a large portion of the "Ten Tribes" carried

away by the Assyrians. In a peculiar and empathic sense this was the age of the prophets. Its beginning coincides with the most powerful religious development of the Hebrews. The latter half of it was also their golden age of literature.

The fourth period embraces the separate existence of Judah, from 721 to 586 B.C., when Jerusalem was thrown down and the chief people were taken in his captive train to Babylonia by Nebuchadnezzar. During this period the prophet's voice became half priestly, and the priesthood was steadily growing in organized ability.

The fifth period comprises the fifty years of captivity, from the great deportation in 586, to the "return" under Zerubbabel, in 536 B.C. This was an age of change, political, philosophical, social and religious. With their new government, (of priests), their new theology and new ideas of life, they were a very different people from what they had ever been before. All of their own history prior to the captivity was now ancient history.

The sixth period reaches into the time of Greek influence which followed the conquest of Palestine by Alexander in 332 B.C. This is the priest period, the period of theological law-making and of history-writing with a purpose. The characteristics of this age were carried back and stamped upon the annals of all the previous ages. Our common ideas of the older periods are true of this age alone.

The seventh period reaches down to the wars of the Maccabees, the glory of whose revolt for religious independence may be roundly dated at 165 B.C. We may pause here, for here Old Testament writing pauses, and the only purpose in studying the history is to establish a basis for studying Hebrew literature.

The literature of every nation is based on that nation's history. Every great literary period is the out-flowering of some great political change. If we are unacquainted with the political events, the literature is meaningless. To one who knew nothing of American history, *Barbara Frietchie* would tell nothing. The Old Testament has long been an enigma, because it was dissociated from the political events of the Hebrews. It will have a rational meaning and will be clearly understood when we see how every page of it is rooted in the brave little nation's experience.

*The Tribal Period.*

Higher Criticism finds the Hebrews in their tribal barbarism, battling with the Canaanites for a foothold in what they believed to be the land of their forefathers. These Hebrew tribes of Canaan lived in tents, or very primitive huts; they had no civil laws or central government; the clans gathered in villages, as the American Indians did, and the chiefs were their arbitrary rulers. They had learned something of handicraft while they were slaves in Egypt, but they had learned almost nothing about Egyptian civilization. The history, the literature, the fine arts, the philosophy, the social culture of Egypt, they knew practically nothing about. There is not the faintest probability that any Hebrew who came out of Egypt could write or read, either the Egyptian language or any other.

Let us imagine that a company of slaves from the plantations of Florida escaped from their masters in the year 1860, and found their way to some savage land, where they should in time work out a civilization of their own. You can easily understand that such people going out from our country would not carry any appreciable knowledge of our philosophy, our science, our inventions, our literature, our social customs. While among us they had known practically nothing about these things. Thousands of Southern slaves never were five miles from the plantation, never saw a great public building, never heard tell of American literature, knew nothing about the inventions, the history, the fine arts, or the social life of the whites. Wherever they went and whatever their descendants afterward became, their future literature would contain nothing of value concerning us.

The doctrine of immortality was as familiar to the Egyptians of that day as it is to us. It is impossible that the Hebrews could have learned it, for it is not possible that a people should forget that doctrine, and the Hebrews afterward knew nothing of it. During the tribal period Hebrew thought of the future was not as well developed as the earliest missionaries found it among the American Indians. As late as the time of Saul there was no belief in the future that appealed to heart or hope or moral sense. There was nothing more nor better than the simplest and most child-like fear of ghosts. There was no

conception of future rewards or punishments, no dreams of Heaven or progress.

The Egyptians of that old time had an elaborate theology, with a noble conception of the spirituality of the gods; but in the tribal period the Hebrew thought of spirituality is scarcely higher than may be ascribed to fetishism. Their god was simply the "guardian angel" of the tribes. They connected his presence with certain stones. What size or shape or kind of stone we do not know, but they had preserved the tradition that the patriarchs worshiped the gods whose presence was in these stones. The stone itself was called "The House of Jahveh." The tribes carried with them an "ark" or box which contained one of these stones. In that stone dwelt their god. If they would have his help in battle, they must carry the stone with them. When it was captured by the enemy they "mourned after their god."

As an indication of the moral status of the tribal period, it is sufficient to recall the habit of offering human sacrifices in their worship of Jahveh. Jephthah burned his daughter, and Samuel consumed Agag, a prisoner, on the altars of the Lord. The Hebrews were then on a moral plane with the Mexicans of Montezuma's time, and with the ancient Druids of England.

---

### *The Literature of the Tribal Period.*

Of course the Hebrews did not exist as tribes during their slavery in Egypt. In their wanderings and fightings, on the way to Caanan, it was natural that certain men of superior courage and ability should come to the front as the chiefs of clans. When they finally entered Canaan they fought it out among themselves as to which should have the best locations. This lets us into the secret of what is, perhaps, the oldest literary production of the Israelites. That production, not written of course, but widely committed, was finally embodied in the book of Genesis—our xliiith chapter—and was from the beginning known as *Jacob's Blessing*. The connection between the history of the clans and this bit of literature is very simple. It so happened that there were twelve tribes. In the

course of five or six generations, in which facts were forgotten and replaced by traditions, these tribes had found their locations in various parts of the half-conquered country, and had made their reputations, as fighters, or cowards, or wanderers, or men of peace, &c. Some had good locations and were successful. Some had poor locations and were weak.

Always and everywhere people like to feel that what has come to pass was foreordained. The tribes which had good places were proud to think it had been thus decreed for them. To the tribes which had poor places it was a comfort to feel that the unpleasant fact had been decreed. They would rather believe that some old doom had descended upon them than simply to confess that their fathers had been whipped by their uncles.

Some shrewd fellow among them was able to meet this necessity. In all barbarous times the blessing or cursing of a dying chief was supposed to carry magic power for many generations. There were twelve tribes. These twelve tribes, in one way and another, had come to be called by name. Whether their names came from persons or from circumstances it is difficult to tell. Our author went back to the old tradition of the time when the forefathers had lived in Canaan, before the slavery. He said there was a great old patriarch who had twelve sons, and these were really the fathers of the twelve tribes. To these twelve imaginary brothers he gave the names of the twelve tribes. When he was dying the old patriarch pronounced a prophetic blessing—most of it is cursing, however—on the twelve sons. Read it. Genesis xl ix. It is a cunning piece of work, with a genuine literary instinct. The character which the author makes old Jacob give to each of the sons tallies quite remarkably with the circumstances of the tribe which bore that name at the author's time. This composition became immediately popular because it explained (?) to all the ignorant masses why their tribe had been fortunate or unfortunate.

Now let us take up the other bit of very ancient literature. Of course, in those slowly progressive generations after the exodus, the Israelites would naturally work out something of a legal code for themselves. That would be a very gradual work,

as it must be with a primitive people. Year after year and generation after generation the chiefs and the wise old men would get together and settle certain matters of property right, certain matters of marriage and family right, certain matters of religious and ceremonial rite. That code of primitive and peculiar laws, as it was finally rounded up, you will find embodied in the book of Exodus, chapters xxi., xxii., and to the nineteenth verse of chapter xxiii. It was called in ancient times *The Covenant*, because these were the laws which the chiefs covenanted with each other to enforce. That code recognizes slavery, and polygamy, and the selling of children, and personal revenge, even to the taking of life. Such were the moral standards of that barbarian time. The intellectual standard was such that this primitive code provides for the criminal punishment of animals. You will find in this code also the real old barbarian hospitality and generosity. If any should take a poor man's coat for security of debt he should return it before dark, for it is the poor man's covering. You will find in this primitive code the establishment of the seventh day of the week as a day of rest. That is all they provided for; simply a day of rest. There was no dream of a Sabbath of worship. You will find also the establishment of the feast of unleavened bread in memory of their release from Egyptian slavery. It is not called the feast of Passover. The story of how an angel "passed over" and slew the first born of the Egyptians had not yet been invented.

No man can read that old code of laws intelligently without feeling that he is far back toward the beginning of organized society. These laws deal with such petty questions as only the clansmen of a primitive age have not outgrown. If a father finds himself financially embarrassed, and sells his daughter with the purpose of paying his debts, shall that daughter, purchased by another Israelite, be kept as a house slave, or may she be sent into the field to toil with the men slaves and the women slaves that were bought or captured of the heathen? A very nice point in jurisprudence; but those old chieftains agreed among themselves that their daughters thus sold into slavery should not be sent to the field. If an ox should form the habit of goring people with his horns, what should be done

with that wicked ox? Should he be tied up, or killed, or should they make an example of him? These primitive law-makers concluded that a wicked ox ought to be punished the same as a wicked man. He should be pounded to death with stones as a solemn warning to all other wicked oxen. Even after death his character should be stigmatized. His flesh should not be eaten by men. It should be thrown out as carion. They supposed that final disgrace—that men should not eat him—would have had a very moral effect on other oxen. You see that we are dealing with a people who are yet not only in their moral but in their intellectual childhood.

This code of laws was completed before the time of Saul. It says nothing about a king, and nothing about a temple, and nothing about a priesthood. The priesthood, which long afterward was fabled to have begun with Aaron, was not yet established. These laws proclaim capital punishment for the worship of any other god than Jahveh. Of course they believed in the existence of other gods, but Jahveh was their god and him only should they worship.

*CHAPTER III.*

## THE NATIONAL PERIOD.

Now let us address ourselves to the question: How did those barbarian tribes ever come to be a nation? We read the surface story of how it was done in the book of Samuel. We are told that the people with one accord rose up and asked for a king, and that Samuel laid the matter before their god, Jahveh, and that Jahveh reluctantly and jealously and ironically granted their request and sent Samuel out to find and anoint a king. That would be very simple, indeed, if the great events of history ever happened in that way—but they don't. These thirteen American colonies did not come to be the United States in any such easy and simple way as that. The Netherland States did not come to be a Dutch Republic in any such easy and simple fashion. The old Feudal States did not round into the modern empires of Europe in any such gentle and quiet way. Oh, no. It required mighty revolutions and prolonged wars, and generations of sacrifice and conquest and destruction and study, to bring these nations out of the former chaos. If there is one thing above another that no people on the face of the earth ever did willingly, ever did until they were compelled by the most awful necessities to do it, that thing is to form a centralized government. To build a nation means that every independent chieftain shall give up his power, that every tribe or clan or feudal state must surrender its inherited rights, that every fortressed and armed company of traders shall yield its special privilege, that every aristocratic prince shall forego the ancestral glory of his house, that every pirate fleet and every robber band shall come into subjection, that every ambitious man shall renounce the honors and the glory he has already won and meekly take his chances of promotion in the new regime. We are too well acquainted with human nature. Men do not willingly make these surrenders

of personal power. Any set of men that could do so would be a set of stupids, altogether too weak to form a nation, or keep it alive when once formed. Only that kind of men who struggle to the death for their personal privileges, right or wrong, are the men who have stuff in them to build a nation of. Your gentle and trusting men who go to an old soothsayer, and say, "Give us a king to rule over us," are not the kind of men that future centuries ever hear tell of.

How did the Israelite tribes become a nation? Just as every other set of states or tribes or clans or colonies became a nation. Every nation on earth had its origin in some awful war for existence. Some great enemy came from without, and the little states must unite or be separately crushed. It was England that made our nation. It was Spain that made the Dutch Republic. It was the marvelous Mohammedan empire that lifted Spain and the other European kingdoms out of their feudal chaos. It was the attacks of the continent that developed England. It was the Philistine horde that compelled the nation of Israel. Those old Israelite tribes were not very moral and not very learned, but no set of Modocs or Apache Indians were more desperate in a fight. They had been in slavery once and they did not purpose to go there again.

---

*Saul, The Giant,*

head and shoulders above ordinary men, who had already gained such a reputation in war that the mention of his name made people's hair stand on end, and whose wrath was like the raging of a wounded lion, so that when he was angry people thought he was possessed of the anger of the gods—1st Sam., xi: 6—it was this raging Saul who now comes into the history.

The enemy had captured a multitude of Israelites and shut them up in a walled town and had given them this horrible choice—they might all be massacred in the pen, or they could have their eyes torn out and be carried away into perpetual slavery. The men begged a few days' mercy that they might decide which fate they would accept. In the meantime they contrived to get word to Saul. Saul went about the business

in the grand old barbarian way. He chopped up two oxen and sent swift heralds all through the tribes carrying those bloody pieces, and crying: "Thus, O men of Israel, if you do not rally around the banner of Saul before to-morrow noon." They rallied; and the roaring giant led them into a victorious battle, and the fated prisoners of Jabesh were released. (1st Sam., chap. xi.)

That was the beginning of the great Israelite war for independence. A war that lasted eighty years. Nearly forty years under Saul; more than forty years under David. From middle life until his old age this giant Saul, this lion of the tribe of Benjamin, did battle for the homes and the liberties of Israel. Of course he came to be an organizer and gathered a strong army about himself. Of course he was a despot and a tyrant whom his own soldiers admired and feared as they might admire the power and fear the wrath of an incarnate devil. After some great battle the soldiers proclaimed him their king, as the Roman army used to do—or perhaps, he proclaimed himself king, and compelled Samuel to anoint him. That was why Samuel didn't like it. The warrior was becoming more powerful than the soothsayer.

On the general subject of kings we may truthfully say that there comes a time in the intellectual development of nations when kings are a hindrance to progress, but in the early history of nation-building they were essential. Without kings, powerful, despotic and implacable, there never could have been a nation on the face of the earth. It required just such men of daring and wrath and blood as the son of Kish to bring those wild Israelite warriors into subjection and organize those ignorant and rebellious tribes into a central government. In forty years of war Saul had laid the foundations of a monarchy which lasted five centuries. No priest could have done it. Such work does not lie within the boundaries of priestly method.

Every student of history knows that war is a heat in which men can be fused into a union as iron is welded with fire. Our own congress did more to centralize legislation in five years of war than it could do in fifty years of peace. During one great century of war the Mohammedan empire was created out of

scattered fragments. During forty years of war Saul got the tribal idea pretty well hammered out of those old Israelite heads and the national idea about half hammered in.

---

### *David, Not "The Psalmist."*

It was not in the nature of things that Saul should have smooth sailing in his own camp. He was not a smooth man. Old Samuel was there to do what mischief he could. He was a smooth man—as smooth as Merlin. Trouble came in the shape of a rival king. A young hero by the name of David, a dare-devil equal to Saul himself, was urged on by Samuel and by his own ambitions. Saul and David fought the common enemy and fought each other, but David was young and aged Saul must die.

O, this David, how he has been whitewashed! And how belittled! He was not a good little man; he was a bad great man. We have him doddled down the centuries as a singer of sweet psalms, a pensive player on the harp, the collector of a church building fund, the maker of a tearful ode when King Saul dies; we have him declaring that Saul had been "pleasant and lovely" in his life. All that would be about as true of Borgia or of Nero as of David. If David had been that kind of a man the half-born Israelite nation would also have died with Saul. Pleasant and musical and poetic times had not yet come. There must be a lion's whelp to growl when the old lion could not roar. The Israelites must still have an indomitable master. There were forty more years of horrible war before the nation should be firmly established. There must be a savage leader for that savage period. David was the man.

You get some real glimpses at David in those stories of how he slew lions and bears on the mountains, and how he overcame a Philistine giant in single combat. This Goliath story, however, has all the metal taken out of it by the priestly historian. The slender shepherd lad with his sling and his pebbles will do for the infant class, but it will not do for anybody outside of the infant class. You get another genuine look at David in that story of the murder of Saul's seven grandsons

after Saul's death. The author has glossed the fact all it would bear, but there is the fact. David meant to rid himself of all rivals or possible pretenders to the throne. Read that touching lament for Saul in the first chapter of Second Samuel, and then read this murderous account in the twenty-first chapter, and imagine, if you can, the difficulties of the historian. Even through the whitewashing you catch glimpses here and there of the real character. David might collect the money, but he could not build the temple, because he had been "a man of blood." I suppose the simple fact is that he contemplated building a temple to his god. Jahveh he worshiped as the god of battle. He would offer praise to his warrior divinity. Constant war too long delayed his building. You get another very close look at David in that disreputable affair with Bathsheba and Uriah.

No psalm singer was David, unless he sang the one hundred and ninth psalm. No ode-writer and no gentle spirit was he; but a sensual, revengeful, implacable warrior, at once brave and cunning, shrewd and restless, but an infinitely selfish, Cromwellian sort of patriot. He started out on Saul's foundation to build a kingdom that should be his own kingdom, and he slaughtered his enemies in the field and his rivals in the home with equal zest. He had the kind of a conscience that never protested until after the deed was done. Then he could repent—David always repented in public—and make it right with the people.

The intellectual development of the Israelites during that eighty years of war had been so immense as to lift them out of their lingering barbarism and set them on their feet as a civilized, nationalized and progressive race. If Solomon had been another Saul or David, Israel might have become a great nation.

The time comes, late in history, when war, like a king, is a hindrance to the progress of civilization; but in the early production of civilization all other forces combined do not equal a great and successful war. It is the only force that can vitalize the minds of primitive men.

*Solomon, The Uuwise.*

During that great century from 1100 to 1000 B. C., the Israelite tribes were developed into a nation. The possibility lay before them of developing into a great nation. They, instead of the Persians, the Medes, the Assyrians, the Babylonians, the Greeks, might have risen to the position of power; might have become, next to Egypt, the sovereign empire of the Mediterranean world.

The ambition for great conquest and splendid empire must have burned in the souls of all prominent men during the later years of David's life. If the fatal mistake of hereditary kingship had not been immediately decided upon, if some great soldier of David's army had succeeded him, as he succeeded Saul, it is impossible to imagine how different the history of the world might have been.

Another eighty years like that eighty under Saul and David, another eighty years of conquest and centralization, another eighty years of military discipline and of such wondrous intellectual development as it would have brought, and the Mediterranean sea from the Nile around to the Bosphorus might have been girded with the fortresses and the growing cities of the great Israelite monarchy. But David had too much confidence in his literary son. Solomon was to David, politically, what Richard Cromwell was to sturdy and resistless old Oliver. If Mohammed had been succeeded by a peace-loving and art-loving son, who wasted his father's revenue and wore out the lives of his father's men in building needless mansions in useless places, the Mohammedan empire so auspiciously begun would have sunk down again into political insignificance. After Mohammed came the great calif, Omer, and after him other great califs, each winning his way to supreme command by supreme abilities. Each successive ruler was a genius and a master, like the first, and so the empire grew to wondrous proportions. That David was strong enough to impose his weak son upon the Israelite nation was the nation's fate. An old and well-established nation can endure the Louis XVI's who come along in the hereditary succession; but a new nation that is still fighting for existence, and whose work must

be an outreaching and daring and conquering work, needs a strong man at the helm.

Solomon was the kind of a ruler that would wreck even an old and well-established kingdom ; no marvel if he wrecked a kingdom that was yet in its pulpy babyhood. I do not refer especially to Solomon's immorality, though in that regard he was a bad enough example, and his entire influence must have been to sensualize the nation, and sensuality is inherent weakness ; still we must remember that some of the most immoral men of history have been among the greatest and most successful statesmen. They have had intellectual ability and personal force of character still greater than their passions. I refer to the weakness of Solomon's statesmanship.

There are two ways in which a young man or a young nation can invest money. If a young man puts money into land that is well situated, where business will come to it and increase its value, he prepares a fortune for himself. If he puts vast money into a fine house, not a business house but a luxurious palace for his personal comfort, that house, the repairing of it, the keeping it up as an establishment, will absorb what fortune he has left and itself will constantly decrease in value, and he shall sink into abysmal debts.

It is exactly so with a young nation. It needs to put its money and the energy of its manhood into the acquirement of territory—all the territory it can protect. There were people in America who thought that Adams and Jay and Franklin were foolishly greedy in driving through that treaty of Paris by which we secured the wild and wonderful territory from the Blue Ridge to the great lakes and to the Mississippi. What could we do with all that territory? We have found use for it.

Again, when Jefferson and Monroe carried the purchase of Louisiana from Napoleon, paying him \$15,000,000 that our young nation could poorly spare, there were people who thought it a great waste of money. But we have found magnificent use for that territory. Just think what that Louisiana territory was—the states of Louisiana, Arkansas, Missouri, Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska, half of Minnesota, half of Colorado, North and South Dakota, Wyoming and the Indian Territory. All of that for \$15,000,000! If that \$15,000,000 had been put into a

great palace, somewhere in the Pennsylvania woods, to moulder and decay and leave not a wrack behind, you would have the statesmanship of Solomon instead of the statesmanship of Jefferson.

You remember how Florida and California and New Mexico and Alaska have all been purchased, and how people complained at the waste of money, and how every dollar of the cost has proven to be worth a thousand or ten thousand dollars to us. That is the way Rome built itself up, that is the way Mohammedanism built itself, that is the way England and every other great nation built itself—if not with an enormous expenditure of money, then with an enormous expenditure of men in battle—by reaching out for territory in the vigorous days of the nation's youth.

Instead of using money and men that way, Solomon built houses. He was a dilettante at architecture. We are told not only that he put a fortune into the temple, but that for thirteen years he was building himself a royal palace, and then he built another royal palace up in Mt. Lebanon, and a third royal palace for his Egyptian wife. Then we are told that he built a number of cities outright—Tadmor in the wilderness, Beth-horon the upper and Beth-horon the nether, Baalath, and many more. Like Louis XIV. and Louis XV., instead of using the national treasury to expand the national power and lay the foundations of a great and prosperous future, he squandered the treasury, sapped the life of the nation in vain and foolish luxuries of architecture.

No man can understand the downfall of the French monarchy until he walks through those miles and miles of costly palaces. Louis XIV. alone spent more money on palaces than the United States paid for that whole wondrous realm between the Mississippi river and the Pacific ocean. We were able to buy from France that magnificent territory, which we have carved into eight or ten great states, for \$15,000,000, largely because the French monarchs had pauperized their nation with needless and foolish architecture.

The French monarchs ought to have known better. They had a melancholy example near at hand. Italy had pauperized herself by architecture. The cathedrals had sapped the last

dollar of Italy's treasury, and the disreputable schemes put on foot to raise money for the completion of St. Peter's broke the back of the Catholic church and started the great Protestant revolt. To this day Italy has not recovered from that pauperizing of herself to build cathedrals. The French monarchs with their fatal palaces, and the popes with their suicidal churches, might all have learned from Solomon, who squandered the money and the manhood of his little empire on fine houses which the heathen pulled down and annihilated.

---

### *The Crisis.*

Before Solomon's death he had hopelessly weakened the nation. Men become heroes in war. They became beasts of burden in these vast royal enterprises of palace-building. In less than thirty years after the completion of the temple the Israelite nation broke asunder, and henceforth, for two hundred and fifty years more, we have two insignificant, petty, quarreling kingdoms, so small and so weak and so hopeless of any political future as to demand our pity. In all political history that is the most melancholy case of arrested development.

When a man or a nation has once held the reins of power, has entertained great hopes and felt the hot pulse of lofty ambitions, and when those hopes and ambitions have been thrown down and crushed; in nearly every case that man or that nation sinks into the weakness and the irritability of discouragement. Year after year with the man, and generation after generation with the nation, may be harbored the dream of attaining and surpassing all that was lost; but the energy and bravery to accomplish that dream are dead. The dream becomes a romance, and it may work a great inward change of character, but the outward greatness seldom comes a second time. More seldom to nations than to individuals.

“There is a tide in the affairs of men,  
Which, taken at the flood, leads on to fortune;  
Omitted, all the voyage of their life  
Is bound in shallows and in miseries.”

That is even more true of the tides in the affairs of nations. The flood tide of Israelite affairs was at the coronation of Solo-

mon. Solomon omitted to swing the nation up into the progressive current, and all its political voyage thereafter was bound in shallows and in miseries.

We shall appreciate more clearly the case of Israel if we pause to imagine what the history of our own American republic might have been. The flood tide of our American affairs came in the winter of 1782-3. The Revolutionary war was practically at an end. The work of arms was complete. Now came the work of brains. The great quadruple treaty with England and France and Spain, which was to fix the boundaries resulting from the war, was in process of negotiation. In his magnificent work on "*The Critical Period of American History*," Fiske has told, better than any other, the interesting story. There was a Spaniard, the Count Aranda, in that great conference, who appreciated the danger of giving the Americans too much land. He wrote a letter to his monarch which contains this famous prophecy—prophecy of evil to monarchies : "The federal republic is born a pygmy. The day may come when it will be a giant—even a colossus. \* \* \* The facility for establishing a new population on immense lands will draw thither the farmers and artisans of all nations." But with this great danger in their minds, the Yankee shrewdness of John Jay and the trip-hammer persistence of John Adams and the deep, quiet, smooth manouvering of Benjamin Franklin, were too much for the determined Englishmen and the wily Frenchmen and the tricky Spaniards. After eighteen months of the most consummate skill and tact the greatest treaty in the history of statesmanship, the Treaty of Paris, was signed on September 3, 1783, and that treaty gave the "pygmy republic" all the lands from the Atlantic to the Mississippi river, and from the Great Lakes to Louisiana and Florida. England and France were jealous of each other, and England and Spain were jealous of each other, and France and Spain were jealous of each other, and these long-headed Americans played upon the jealousies of all of them, and at last verified the old fable by dividing the broken shell among the kings and taking the kernel themselves.

Now, suppose that our young republic had been represented in that great council of nations by weak men or by men lack-

ing in the genius of statesmanship, by men who could be bought off from their great ambitions with money. Suppose that our commissioners had been willing to accept a few million dollars in lieu of that vast territory, and that the money had been expended in a superb palace for the chief executive—that would have been Solomon's kind of statesmanship. Suppose the United States had been confined to this little strip of land along the Atlantic coast from Boston to Charleston, while England kept all the territory northwest of the Blue Ridge and the Catskills and the White Mountains, while Spain and France divided the whole great West and South between them; that would have given the United States the kind of an outlook that Solomon gave to Israel. Suppose that as time went on, three or four great nations should have grown up around us, confining our republic to a narrower and smaller strip of land along the Atlantic seaboard—that would have been a repetition of the conditions of Israel in the times that followed Solomon. "Solomon the Wise." He may have been wise as a proverb-maker; wise in the realm of the naturalist, when "he spake of beasts and birds, and the hyssop that springeth out of the wall;" but he was far from wise as a nation-maker, and he spake very foolishly when he ordered the energies of his people consumed in heaping up stones into the likeness of royal palaces.

Suppose that our little shoestring republic, confined to the stretching sands of the seashore, had broken in twain a few years after the Declaration of Independence; one little republic centered in Boston and the other little republic centered in Richmond; and that these two republics should have constantly quarreled and fought with each other—each growing weaker and smaller as the nations which crowded them became populous and rich and all powerful—that would have been to repeat the experience of Israel and Judah, which found the Assyrian and the Mede and the Babylonian and the Greek surrounding them and cutting off all hope of national greatness.

With that termination of its political prospects the Hebrew nation must either cease to exist or turn its energies into a new channel.

*Religion and Literature of the National Period.*

The great religious fact of this age was the building of the temple. Our common ideas of that building are immensely exaggerated. The author of *Chronicles* makes it to have cost three or four hundred millions of dollars, but many commentators think that two or three extra noughts have crept into that stupendous estimate. If we divide it by one thousand we shall, perhaps, be as near the truth. The story of the dedication, during which one hundred and forty-four thousand sheep and cattle were offered as sacrifices, also needs to be divided by one thousand. Our common ideas of the elaborate ritualism and the splendid priesthood of that age, must suffer a like shrinkage.

There was no priesthood before there was a temple. Priests, men who had come to be regarded as proper men to conduct religious ceremonies on special occasions, there doubtless were—but no organized priesthood. The priesthood was the natural and necessary result of the temple. The men who were appointed to care for the temple and to lead in the sacrificial offerings very soon formed a priesthood and claimed a monopoly in the entire conduct and regulation of worship. Of course they would eventually claim special privileges and the mediatorship between God and man. Priests always do.

There was doubtless a sincere feeling of devotion in building the temple. Doubtless, also, there was a vast amount of Solomon's personal vanity in the work. Just as doubtless, also, there was a decisive sense of political genius in it. With political union of the tribes, with a centralized government in David's new city, it was natural and proper that religion should be centralized. The great fact in connection with the temple was just this: it broke up the local ideas and habits of worship. It destroyed the isolated altars. It took the conduct of worship out of the hands of the chiefs. It carried the hearts of the people to Jerusalem, where was the centre of political power. It linked together the images of God and the king. It was the beginning of priestly routine. Henceforth Israel became slowly but surely sacerdotal, ecclesiastical, and polytheism slowly died out. With a splendid temple, the conception of

God enlarged and spiritualized. The god of an ambitious nation, worshiped by mitred and solemn priests in a gorgeous building, was very different from the god of a stone that was carried about in a box and captured by the Philistines. Let us understand, however, that in comparison with the elaborate ritualism of the second temple, under Nehemiah, the worship in Solomon's temple was informal and primitive. It was only the awkward and feeble beginning of a new order which required five centuries to develop into the ecclesiasticism of Nehemiah. The Hebrews were not yet a specially religious people as they afterwards came to be.

As for the literature of this period, it is difficult to speak. In the rush of intellectual development during that great century from 1100 to 1000 B. C., it is not unlikely that the Hebrews developed an alphabet and began a crude sort of half-hieroglyphic writing. Two books especially are often quoted or mentioned—"The Wars of the Lord"—and the "Book of Jasher." The first tells its contents in the title. It must have been an account of Israel's wars from Joshua to David. The other was a book of national songs, and songs in honor of great men, such as the song of Moses, the song of Deborah, David's ode to Saul—all of them, of course, written by other people.

These early books were crude both in matter and form, and were replaced by others on the same subjects at a later age. Perhaps we have the gist of *The Wars of the Lord* in *Judges* and *Samuel*, with the best fragments of *Jasher* in the *Psalms*. It is also supposed that there had been worked out during the National Period a primitive Decalogue, "Ten Words" as it was anciently called—a group of moral and religious apothegms—but that, also, was recast by the finer moral sense and higher religious instinct of a later age. We must come along into the third period of the history before we find any noble developments in writing or in theology or in the moral sense or in religious feeling.

*Religious Development.*

In our childhood we supposed that, while other nations were political, military, secular, the Israelites were always and everywhere a praying and worshiping race, whose constant thought was of God and whose greatest energies were expended on theology and ritualism. In a modified sense that came to be the fact under the prophets and priests, but it was not a fact in the earlier centuries.

Every ancient nation developed very characteristic features. The Greeks became a nation of artists and orators. The Romans became a nation of soldiers and lawyers. In the beginning it was not so: the Greeks were not specially artistic, the Romans were not specially given to the study of law, the Israelites were specially religious. Every race characteristic has been a development, a purely scientific result of natural selection, an adaptation of thought and feeling to circumstances. There was something in the climate, something in the geography, something in the incidents and accidents of its early history to give this or that turn to the popular thought of each race. Once an ancient race was started on a particular line of development it followed that line with great persistence and with a singleness of mind which would be impossible to modern nations. Ancient nations had little intercourse with each other. They met only to fight. They did not study each other's literature or politics or theology or social customs. With a spirit of most intense bigotry and most stolid exclusiveness they loved their own ideas and customs, and blindly hated all other.

In these days an Englishman or a German or an American would be a metropolitan sort of man whether you placed him in Yucatan or Labrador, because he has studied the life of all races and traveled everywhere and has absorbed the spirit of universal genius. The world is his home; human history is his text book; the laws of nature are his appeal. People are getting rid of characteristics now. To be peculiar is not good form. To dwell on one idea and neglect everything else is to be deemed a crank or a madman. In olden times an entire nation would pursue one line of thought or one line of work century after century. Thus the Greeks pursued art, until

they brought it to such perfection as we moderns cannot even copy, much less rival. Thus the Romans pursued law and the science of government, until they became the teachers of all ages in the matter of organization. Thus the Israelites pursued the sentiment of religion, until their sermons and exhortations and prayers and psalms of praise, their expressions of worship and their longings for the spiritual and the immortal, shall be the models for man's expression of his devout feeling in all the coming years.

I have been asked why I keep the Bible on my pulpit and read texts from it if I do not believe that God wrote it. Go ask the artist why he studies a Greek statue and constantly refers to its lines of beauty, if he does not believe that God carved it. Yes, we call a man a crank who knows only one thing; but your crank is likely to know that one thing a great deal better than other folks know it. Genius is the respectful word—an enemy says "crank." In his line the man of one idea is your teacher, but you stultify yourself and put him in a false position when you ask him to teach you anything that is not in his line. We go to the Greek to learn art, but we do not go to the Greek to learn morals or commerce or the science of political organization. We go to the Israelite to learn religion, but we do not go to the Israelite to learn geography or geology or any natural science or politics or literature or anything but the depth and height and wondrous expression of religious feeling. We do not even go to the Bible to learn theology, or if we do we shall get sadly mixed. The Bible has this one sole glory—it is the supreme and multiform statement of religious feeling. That became the characteristic of Israelite life, and the Bible contains just what the Israelites lived. The Hebrews were not primarily religious in any remarkable degree. That wonderful sentiment was developed by the circumstances of their history.

## CHAPTER IV.

## ISRAEL AND JUDAH.

*The New Ideal.*

If our American Republic had been hindered, cramped, divided, crushed, as the Israelite nation was, what, suppose you, would have been the result in the thought and feeling of our public leaders? What turn would their aspirations have taken?

Say what you will, the hopes and the aspirations of national leaders are moulded by their conception of providence, by what they conceive to be the "manifest destiny" of their nation. We know what conception of manifest destiny has inspired our American leaders. They have believed that God meant to develop this into a wondrously great nation of liberty and equality. Absolute faith in the unspeakably grand future of this nation, its ability to cope with the whole world while it should be a refuge for the oppressed of the whole world—that has been the noble belief in providence which inspired every great leader, and moulded public sentiment, from the days of old Sam Adams until now.

Suppose that great dream had been utterly broken and crushed. Suppose, as we come along down to the days of John Quincy Adams and Jackson and Webster and Clay, that all hope of our great political future had vanished, that all confidence in the conquering power of our armies had been dispelled, what then would they have concluded was the purpose of God, the working of his providence, concerning us? What would they have said was our manifest destiny? I think it perfectly clear that the children of the Puritans would have said on this wise: "Our revolutionary fathers thought God intended to build a great nation here, but we now see that such was not his purpose. Our fathers believed that God meant to establish a vast republic by means of armies and the

acquisition of territory, but we now see that such was not his method. The divine purpose in us is not a great nation. The divine method is not the use of armies. God's purpose evidently is that we shall be the conservators of true religion. We shall keep inviolate and diligently teach the Puritan faith. That is what our forefathers were guided across the wild ocean to this wilderness for. That is why we were given our independence. That is why we were not allowed to become a great nation. God would not have our minds distract with vast political ambitions. He would compel us to the strict recognition of our work as the conservators of religious truth. We must recognize our mission on earth to be the preservation and the spread of the Puritan faith."

That is the way our leading men would be talking and writing to-day if the treaty of Paris had been conducted by such a diplomat as Solomon. That is exactly the way the leading Israelities began to feel and talk and write in the sad century that followed Solomon. For several succeeding centuries that was the popular conviction. The great hope of political empire was gone. Confidence in the prowess of kings and armies was gone. When the keen edge of that disappointment had worn dull and smooth the leading men began to say, "Our destiny is a religious one. We are to stand among the heathen nations as representative of the true faith." It is a curious fact, but an everlasting fact, that men accept the weaknesses and mistakes just as they accept the wisdoms and victories of their history as the working out of Divine purpose in their behalf. The political weakness and ignorance of Solomon came to be regarded as God's design. That is the perfectly natural way in which the Israelites became an especially religious people. The failure through Solomon's incompetence of their political ambitions, the binding of their political history in shallows and in miseries, gave the religious turn to their thoughts and feelings. Then it was easy for them to look backward and says: "Why, of course; strange we never saw it before! That is why God led our fathers out of Egypt; that is why He gave Canaan into their hands; that is why He drove out the heathen by the hands of Saul and David; that is why the tribes were cemented into a nation;

that is why we were not allowed to become a great and ambitious nation ; that is why God keeps us alive, but keeps us humble and weak among nations, that by means of us He might preserve the true religion in the midst of the world's great heathenisms."

Henceforward, generation after generation and century after century, that was the conception which the Israelites had of their manifest destiny. Thus in a perfectly natural way they came to think of themselves as a chosen people, whose mission in the world was theological and whose work and whose methods must be different from the work and the methods of all other nations. That new conception of their destiny grew in seriousness and in power until it became a thing of marvelous influence, not only in their souls but in human history. This new and mighty dream that they were called of God to preserve and teach the one true and holy religion—that dream became their energy, their patient endurance, their light and inspiration ; and it led them on, age after age, and developed their strange, grand characteristics and made them the world's religious teachers.

---

*Prophets and Prophecy.*

During the period of the Two Kingdoms, from 975 to 721 B. C., the kings in a limited sense were the rulers of the Hebrew people, but the prophets were the leaders of thought, the moulders of character, the fashioners of the mental and moral and political destinies of the race. The religious sentiment became, as we have seen, the dominant impulse upon the division of the kingdom. The men who stand for the dominant impulse are the real directors of the currents of a people's life. Just as the artists and orators and poets of Greece were more powerful than the political rulers, because art and literature were the dominant impulses of Greek life ; so the prophets were the directing geniuses of Hebrew life, because religion had come to be the chief concern of the Hebrews.

The prophets were not men of any official station, as the popes and cardinals of the Catholic church, or even as the ordained clergymen and preachers of the Protestant churches.

They were not allied with any organization. They did not aim to build a church or a party. They were unordained preachers, independent reformers, orators, writers, like Savanarola, Luther, Wilberforce, Garrison, if these had been unconnected with all organizations. They were the self-appointed, God-called teachers of whole people, who spake for the truth and the right as they understood it; and they were responsible to nobody. They did their work as poets and artists and historians do, speaking their word out of their own free convictions.

The priests were officers of the Temple ; in a sense, of course, officers of the government, dependent on the favors of kings as the officials of an established church always are. The priests of this third period of history were not the power they afterward came to be. Their time had not yet arrived. The prophets were the unorganized, isolated, independent moulders and directors of popular thought and feeling.

Our childhood idea of the prophets was that they were men to whom God revealed the secrets of the future, and that their mission was to stand forth on occasion and tell the people or the king what would come to pass a year or a century or several centuries hence. The sooner we get over that childish idea the better it will be for our intelligent appreciation of history. Whenever and wherever you find a book that contains any minute and circumstantial description of a future historic event you may rest assured that the book, or at least that part of it, was written after the event. In that extraordinary and miraculous sense of the word we shall be on safe ground, as students of history, to put aside the thought that there ever was any such thing as prophecy. Of course, in the ordinary and natural sense of the word all literature is filled with prophecy. All scientific teaching, all political exhortation, is packed with predictions of what will come to pass under this or that set of conditions. The elder Pitt predicted at the outset of the revolutionary war that the American colonies would gain their liberty. Count Aranda predicted that our pigmy republic would become a colossus if it laid hands on the Mississippi valley. The aged Toscanelli, watching the advance of science, forty years before the ships of Columbus were fitted out, pre-

dicted that Europeans would yet sail westward across the ocean to China. Seneca, the Roman philosopher, at about the year 50 A. D. had predicted that travelers would yet discover a western route to the Indies. Strabo, the Greek geographer, writing about the time of Christ's birth, predicted that the Atlantic ocean contained somewhere a vast, inhabited, unknown world. These prophecies, of course, had nothing miraculous in them, and were not the results of any special inspiration from heaven. They were the bold judgments of thoughtful men who carefully studied the political or scientific conditions.

Moral teachers who are careful students of social and national affairs have always been able to predict something of the future course of events. When Eli Whitney invented the cotton gin there were a thousand men who could dimly foresee its political effects in American history—how it would increase the cotton plantations—how it would increase the demand for slave labor—how it would increase the demand for slave territory—and southern politicians, especially in Virginia, who had hitherto been anxious to get rid of slavery, changed their tactics.

Any man to-day who has a free mind and reads the great literature of the age and notes the trend of popular thought can predict the utter collapse and destruction of endless punishment, and he can prophesy the condition of the religious world when that disreputable old dogma shall no longer exist. He can foretell with perfect clearness that churches will then give more heed to moral culture than to the catechism, that character and kindness will be considered more sacred than creeds, that persecution for opinion's sake will be done away, and that a thousand stupid prejudices which now burden and humiliate religion will give place to the finer sentiments which bless human society.

In this perfectly natural way the prophets looked out into the future years and pictured the blessings and the calamities that would come of good or evil conduct. Time was when they predicted the downfall of their own nation for its own vices. Because this appeal to the future was their habit, their style of preaching, they were called, not reformers, as we should

properly call them, but prophets. They were no more able than any other class of men to see specific and unrelated events of the future. A prophet could no more tell the name of a king or give an account of a battle a hundred years in the future than a politician to-day could name the President or outline the campaign of the year 2000. When you read any such specific prophecy you may know it was not written till afterward.

Hebrew religion, like all other, made its first development as a theology, then a later and better development as a moral impulse.

---

### *Theological Prophets.*

For about a hundred and seventy-five years after the division of Solomon's kingdom the prophets were mainly concerned with theology. Their great aim was to establish belief in the God of Israel, and to root out the lingering polytheism of the times. Elijah, who lived at the centre of that period, and who was in the midst of his great battle at the year 900, may be taken as the type of the theological prophets. The prophets of that age were not writers. We only know them, as we know the old kings, by the histories which were written centuries later. Of course the characteristic stories concerning them have been greatly exaggerated, but the exaggerations do not remove the fact that these stories are characteristic. The story of Elijah's sacrifice, as told in the eighteenth chapter of first Kings, has been miraculously improved since its first telling, but the spirit of it is characteristic. Not historically true in the sense of giving the physical facts—historically true in the higher sense that it tells us very clearly what kind of a reformer Elijah was. He was such a reformer as Calvin, as Torquemada. If he could not persuade he would compel the acceptance of his theology. Nearly all theologies of the past were established by physical force. The end justified the means, though the means were deceit and murder.

From the year 975, on down to about the year 800 B. C., the prophets toiled and battled for belief in the God of Israel. It was a theological reform. It was followed by the great moral reform. Moral reform is a higher and finer work than theological

reform, and comes later in social development. With the coming of the great moral prophets who looked upon conduct as equally sacred with and quite as important as belief, who regarded virtue as vastly more important than ritualism—with their advent, about the year 800 B. C., we enter upon the noble and inspiring period of Hebrew history.

---

### *The Epoch of Reform.*

From the division of the kingdom, 975 B. C., to about the year 800 B. C., the work of the prophets was mainly directed against polytheism, and their ideal was to establish the worship of Jahveh, *as their national deity*. Like nearly all other theologians, these early prophets supposed that the one thing needful in this world was correct belief, worship of the true God. The century that followed, from 800 to 700 B. C., was the great Hebrew epoch of moral teaching. Following back the line of our religious ancestry through twenty-seven centuries, we find three epochs of distinct and supreme moral teaching. During these periods character is set above theology, righteousness is considered more divine than ritual, a pure heart is deemed more sacred than any creed or church or day or book or form of worship, morality is glorified as the very essence of religion. The last of these epochs was inaugurated by Dr. Channing and furthered by the Unitarian church and the great liberal literature of this century. The second was the Christian era—the preaching of Jesus. The first was the era of the ethical prophets in the 8th century B. C. Throughout the rest of the long history the leaders and teachers have placed the dominant emphasis on belief or ritual or church organization. Of course it is not meant that morals were neglected. Exactly that is meant which is said. The Temple service and the ritualistic observances, among the Hebrews; the priestly hierarchy and the infallibility of the Pope, among Catholics; salvation by faith, among Protestants, have been the *chief concerns*. These distinctly theological matters have been placed *above* conduct, deemed *more* sacred than character. Personal righteousness was the central and supreme demand of the ethical prophets and of Jesus, as it has been of modern

Unitarianism and modern literature. Of course it is not meant that the ethical prophets were indifferent to theological belief. Their growing conception of the unity of God was very sacred to them. They would have looked on any heretic who believed in the Trinity as a dangerous man. But they had come to see that true belief was not as important as good conduct. Moral questions are always the supreme questions of the age ; and woe unto the religion, and woe unto the world, when the teachers of religion do not appreciate that simple fact ! The great men who stand for ideal morality must become the supreme men of the age. Whether it be the independent Jesus, the Catholic Savonarola, the heathen Buddha, the Protestant Luther, the dissenting Wesley, the Unitarian Channing, the agnostic Adler, or the Hebrew prophets of old ; whatever their theology, the men of commanding genius in any age who plead and live out a noble morality are the men whose names come down the history of nations with honor and praise.

---

*Morals and Literature.*

The beginning of this great age of Hebrew reform was also the dawn of the golden age of Hebrew literature. It is natural that morality and literature should appear together. Thought and ethics may be divorced, but in their normal estate they are companions—the twin graces of humanity. Brain and heart evermore incline to assist each other. The lesson of history is, that when either is awakened from sleep the other is aroused to action. The supreme moral impulse which Jesus gave the world soon transformed the philosophies of the world. The Italian renaissance of genius called forth Europe's great moral reformation. The reform age inaugurated by Wilberforce in England culminated in the poems of Browning and Tennyson, the novels of Dickens and George Eliot, and the fine critical literature represented by Arnold and Ruskin. The anti-slavery agitation and the glorious literature of New England proceeded from the same soul of progress. Morals and literature both received a new and wonderful impulse about 800 B. C., in that old Palestine home of the Hebrews. The result of this double awakening was a greater and better conception of God. The

prophets no longer thought of their deity as the Lord of Hosts, but as the Lord of Righteousness. In their broader ideas He was no longer the God of Israel, but the God of Nations, whose providence included and whose power blessed or punished the heathen peoples round about.

The *reform period* had its roots in four prominent facts: a gradual development of intellect and moral feeling; a sense of revolt from the formalism and hypocrisy of the priests; a widespread disgust with the cruelty and sensuality of the kings; and the birth of a number of great men. The political conditions were propitious for a moral revolution. The extreme depravity of rulers is always the occasion for reformers. The kings of the two little nations, for these hundred and seventy-five years, had been a race of petty and quarreling tyrants. Some were respectable and weak; some were able (in a small degree) and disreputable. All in all they were a sorry lot. The eighth century was ushered in by two of the strongest since the time of Solomon. Uzziah, of "Judah," for several years was a ruler of promise; but he only fulfilled the hopes of his people in a few successful wars, and in some commercial prosperity. His later influence was a moral and spiritual degradation. Jeroboam II., of "Israel," on a very limited scale, was a sort of Louis XIV.—a fighter, a builder, and a sensualist. Jeroboam II. had larger ability and worse influence than Uzziah. His name was the synonym of vice. His prosperity meant immoral luxury. The manners of the people, under such leadership, were becoming utterly corrupt. Jeroboam II. reigned about forty years; Uzziah nearly fifty. Jeroboam II. had been twenty-five years on his throne, Uzziah ten, when the eighth century dawned. Under these rulers, of cruelty and sensuality, the priesthoods flourished. Religion was a belief and a ritual. If the rites were punctiliously observed right could be dispensed with. Conscience gave place to conformity. Hebrewism was foreshadowing the Catholicism of the dark ages—a luxurious king, a servile priesthood, a debased people, with a spirit of hypocrisy ruling them all. Reform there must be, or the time of dissolution was at hand.

*Prophetic Literature.*

From among the reformers of that magnificent eighth century—how many of them we know not—stand forth the great names of Amos, Hosea, Isaiah and Micah, as the names of Phillips and Garrison stand out from the hosts of American reformers. The oldest book of our Bible, in the sense that it was the first complete book put into its permanent form, is the book of Amos. Whether it was written by Amos may be a question. There seems no good reason why it should not have been. At all events, it gives us the gist of his many years of moral exhortation. It is such a book as we should have if the salient points were taken from a volume of Phillips' anti-slavery orations and combined into one short essay. In about that sense it may represent all that Amos said and wrote. Or it may be that this is simply one brief speech of his, on some most important occasion; scores or hundreds of others having been lost. In this sense we must read nearly all of our prophetic books. They preserve one, or a few, of the prophet's great utterances; or they are, in each case, a resumé of the prophet's work, unsparingly condensed, and put into shape by a later hand.

The book of Amos is launched against the drunkenness, the sensuality, the cruelty, the hypocrisy and the dead religious formalism of the times. His argument is that the nations round about—Damascus, Gaza, Tyre, Edom, Ammon, Moab—have been punished with defeat and slaughter *for their immorality*; and that Israel must likewise suffer unless there be a complete reformation. He considers national destruction as the essential result of immorality. The crimes and vices of the land are already so great that God may raise up an enemy to put them to the sword any day. But he has faith that the worst will only be a discipline, a scourging, and that the remnant of loyal and true souls will be providentially assisted to rebuild a moral nation.

Hosea follows Amos in the same strain. "The Lord hath a controversy with you because of your lying and stealing and killing and committing adultery." "Ye have sown the wind and ye shall reap the whirlwind." This book is a series of disconnected fragments of speeches or writings, and was put

together by the prophet, or some one else, at the close of his labors. Kings, princes, recalcitrant priests, a dissolute public, all share his burning denunciations. He attacks idolatry on moral grounds. Faithfulness to Jahveh is moral faithfulness. "The law" is the law of conduct. He reminds us of Savonarola, especially in his appreciation that example is infinitely more important than creed and ritual. "Like priest, like people," was a home thrust at the bad example which nullifies good teaching. Hosea, like Amos, concludes with a hope of moral restoration and prosperity and peace. Happiness can only come of virtue. A season of success attained by wickedness ends in deeper doom. "The ways of the Lord are right and the just shall walk in them; but the transgressors shall fall therein." Righteousness is a power in this world that must bring destruction to the transgressor.

Next comes Isaiah. Our book of Isaiah, however, is three or four books in one. The last twenty-seven chapters—xl. to lxvi. inclusive—were composed by some unknown author of the sixth century, two hundred years after the time we are considering. That book, which is often called the work of the Second Isaiah, was, by mistake or purpose, finally united to the real Isaiah. Chapters xxxiv. to xxxix., inclusive, must also be subtracted from the original document. So must chapters xxiv. to xxvii., inclusive. Then we must subtract all but the first nine verses of chapter xiii.; the first twenty-three verses of chapter xiv. and the first ten verses of chapter xxi. All these are of much later date than Isaiah.

With all of these subtractions, the original Isaiah is still fragmentary, in the sense that it is a joining together of various prophetic utterances of different periods in the great prophet's career. Great he was, as a man, a reformer, an orator and a writer. Amos and Hosea, with the company of reformers led on by them, had filled the earlier and middle years of the century with an intense moral and intellectual energy. The company led by Isaiah and Micah had their activity in the latter part of the century, drawing on toward the year 700 B. C. Literature had made a splendid development. Isaiah's rhetoric is superb. He handles words and images like a Shakespeare. His literary genius has been his misfortune in

the hands of commentators. The universe could have revealed no greater surprise to him than a fore-vision of the fact that upon one of his figures of speech—vii: 14—the Christian church was to build a heaven-high system of theology. Of course, verse 16 explains it perfectly. The “child” to be born in less than a year from the time he speaks may be called Immanuel—“God with us”—for before that child shall grow out of his babyhood the land of Judah shall be free from the tyranny of the kings which now oppress her. A great many things in the Old Testament would be plain if theologians looked for explanations instead of mysteries. The word “virgin,” in the 14th verse, is a forged mistranslation. The “butter and honey” of the 15th verse refer to the coming peace and plenty, when the threatening kings are dislodged. viii: 3 and 4, is another use of a like figure of speech; but the theologians could hardly wrench that into any mysterious prophecy.

The thought is exactly the same in Isaiah that we have had in Amos and Hosea. Nations are scourged for immorality. The overthrow of armies, the destruction of cities, the blasting of crops, the wasting of flocks and herds by disease; drought, flood, fire, mildew, hail, tempest, pestilence, all calamities, are the scourges with which God makes chastisement for a people's vice. According to the prophets, God often used one bad nation to punish another bad nation. You must not conclude that victory always means favor. When a nation has been thus used as a weapon, it also may be scourged. It was thus that the exhortations of the prophets often got tangled. We shall see, later on, how this mistaken philosophy was appreciated. Like Amos and Hosea, Isaiah belabored the dead and decaying formalism of the priests: “To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices unto me, saith the Lord. Your new moons and your appointed feasts my soul hateth.” All the nations in turn—Damascus, Assyria, Moab, Edom, Tyre, Egypt, Ethiopia—are reviewed, and God's judgments upon them set forth in heroic language. The same *great national hope* re-appears in chapters xxxii. and xxxiii., which are the closing chapters of this wonderful book. Scourging will do its work. By suffering the people shall be reformed. A good

king will be raised up to rule a righteous nation amid peace and plenty.

Micah is a sort of a pocket edition of Isaiah. Isaiah was a man of the city, with fine intellectual culture. Micah was a countryman, who mixes his metaphors, but speaks the moral truth with no uncertain sound. As was the case with Isaiah, the early portions of Micah were written before, and the later portions after, the destruction of Samaria and the downfall of "Israel," in 721 B.C. The Assyrians, hovering upon the northern kingdom with impending doom, finally striking and destroying it, gave the words of these two prophets an especial significance and force.

Micah's earlier rebukes are hurled directly at the capitals of the two nations—Samaria and Jerusalem. Micah supposed that if the Assyrians captured Samaria they would also sweep down and desolate Jerusalem, whose doom he pictures in iii : 12. He has the prophet's hope, however. By this punishment God will purify the Hebrews, and then He will restore them, giving them power to defeat the Assyrians, (v : 5-10).

V : 2 is another famous text which the theologians have grievously tormented into a far-reaching mystery. Kuenen says the translation should be : "From thee, O race of Ephrath," (the stock of David) "small as thou art among Judah's families, out of thee shall come forth one that shall rule over Israel, one whose descent is from ancient times." The simple idea is that, though the Assyrians plough both Samaria and Jerusalem, God will raise up a king of David's line to establish the new and glorious order. Micah was mistaken. The Assyrians ploughed Samaria, but they did not plough Jerusalem; and Samaria had no glorious restoration.

The last two chapters belong to a late period in the prophet's life. The doom of Samaria weighs upon him and changes his voice to a mournful pleading. The Hebrew people is represented as a child that is led out of Egypt and carefully nurtured. The grown child was instructed in God's moral law : "What doth the Lord require of thee but to do justly and love mercy and walk humbly with thy God?" The instruction was neglected, the nurture forgotten ; but now comes penitence,

and God confirms his oath that penitence shall be followed with blessing.

Such is the teaching of these great prophets. There shall be no abiding happiness without righteousness. God punishes only that he may purify. A holy nation He will finally have, though He drag his people through blood and fire to scourge and burn the evil out of them. The prophets talk of nothing beyond the immediate future of their own race. They see nothing but a cleansed and restored Hebrew nation—a nation in whose moral and spiritual influence, all the nations of the earth shall be blessed.

---

### *False Readings.*

All attempts to make them predict Christianity are forced, unnatural, and in the highest degree absurd. However their words may be adapted to the conditions of later centuries, or to the *dream* rather than the conditions, there is no reason to suppose that they, more than others, could tell what man should be born in a given town, and what things he would say and do, and what world-events should loom out of obscurity, seven centuries in the future. They certainly made enough mistakes in predicting the political greatness of their own nation to show that the future was as heavily veiled from their eyes as from ours.

But suppose the prophets could have foreseen that Christ was to be born, that the Christian religion was to be established, that their own religion was to be thrust out and persecuted, that the temple they adored was no longer to be the centre and home of God's church, that the nation they loved better than their own lives was to be broken, dismantled, scattered to the four winds—would they have prophesied any such event very joyously? They are pictured as looking forward to the ruin of all their hopes and ambitions and prides with unspeakable delight—does that seem quite natural?

Can you imagine a race of people, century after century, foretelling the downfall of everything they hold dear in their social and political and religious life; looking forward to that calamity with rapture; toiling and suffering on for its accomplish-

ment? If you cannot, then you must conclude that those alleged prophecies of Christ do not refer to the coming of the Second Person of the Trinity.

What was the one supreme idea of the Jewish religion? The Unity of God. That doctrine they held with all the tenacity of life and love. For it they were ever ready to become martyrs. Can you imagine them constantly and happily predicting a new doctrine, which was to dethrone and root out their own beloved faith and send their children forth to centuries of wandering and persecution? If you cannot, then you must conclude that they never meant to prophesy the Christ of Christian theology.

In Matthew ii:15, we read one of these so-called predictions: "Out of Egypt have I called my son." That is a garbled half sentence from Hosea. Matthew assumes to tell us what Hosea meant. He meant that the babe Jesus would be brought back from Egypt, after Joseph and Mary had fled thither to escape Herod. Luke does not agree with Matthew. Luke positively denies the flight into Egypt; recognizes that Herod had been several years dead when Jesus was born; and says that Joseph and Mary, having no occasion to fly into Egypt or elsewhere, took the child immediately to Jerusalem, and "presented him in the Temple," and then "went to their own home in Nazareth." Read these contradictory accounts in the second of Matthew and the second of Luke. Matthew is always on the watch for prophecy of Christ. He presumes, it would seem, that few people read the Hebrew scriptures, and they with blinded eyes. The Christian church has diligently followed Matthew.

Now, in simplest candor, what did Hosea mean? Turn to xi:1, "When Israel," (the people of Israel) "was a child, then I loved him, and called my son out of Egypt." It is this figure of speech—the Hebrews of the Exodus as God's child—that Micah quotes in vi:4. The prophets were not predictors of distant and mysterious events, but moral exhorters whose words always apply to their people's immediate future.

*Drama.*

The books of the four great prophets above named, (with one possible exception,) contain all the prophetic writings of the eighth century that have been preserved. They are but a few fragments from what must have been an abundant reform literature. It is impossible that an age could produce such writings and they be its entire production. We might as well think it possible that New England, in this nineteenth century, could produce Emerson's *New England Reformers*, Whittier's *Eternal Goodness*, Lowell's *Bigelow Papers*, and Phillips' oration on *Daniel O'Connell*, and produce nothing else. That were as impossible as to suppose that the first and only architecture of Europe consisted of the cathedrals of St. Peter's and Cologne. It is possible to imagine that, three thousand years hence, all else will have perished and been forgotten, and that a few of these greatest and finest products will be all that the men of the year 5,000 shall have or know of the architectural and literary works of Europe and America.

The exception, above noted, is a part of the book of Zechariah. Some portions of chapters ix to xiii may have been written in the eighth century. If so, they were re-written and added to by a later hand.

There were other kinds of writing than the prophetic in that eighth century. There was a dramatic literature as well as a reform literature. There was history, and poetry, also.

In her delightful book on Egyptian explorations—*Pharaoh's Fellahs*—Miss Edwards says that we have looked at mummies until we have associated all Egyptian life with death, and can hardly imagine that Egyptians ever laughed and danced and made love like other folks. Our traditional conception of the Bible is not less absurd. We have studied its solemn exhortations until we can hardly imagine a Hebrew writer putting his thoughts in any other than a hortatory mould, or as having any other thought than the conduct of ceremonial worship, or the lurid thunderings of the law.

That the Old Testament is what we have left of an ancient nation's literature is slowly dawning upon the public mind. That the Hebrews wrote history, just as other people did; that

they clothed their ideas in the forms of poetry, national songs, dramas and novels, just as other people have, is at last getting to be understood.

One sample only of the dramatic writing of the eighth century remains to us—*The Song of Solomon*. This book has suffered unspeakable torture at the hands of theologians. In their irrational demand that it shall be a religious book, and even a book of Christian predictions, they have made it both ridiculous and repulsive. Even as a drama it is not supremely chaste, but as a sermon it were altogether broad. A style of dress may be allowed in the ball room and at the bathing beach that would be scandalizing in church; so a certain style of writing that a drama will bear were quite beyond endurance in a solemn religious appeal. You certainly would not appreciate "Romeo and Juliet" if you read it with the impression that Shakespeare meant it for a theological treatise—a religious allegory—in which Romeo represented Christ and Juliet the Church. Such, however, is the very ridiculous interpretation we have all our lives heard given to the Song of Solomon. Let us understand, first of all, that this book is not theology but drama; not religious, but secular. Of course it has a purpose—a moral purpose, as we shall presently note—a purpose that is not at all complimentary to Solomon.

The exhortations of the prophets had wrought a wonderful work in purifying the family life of the Hebrew people. It can be safely said that no other ancient people esteemed the sanctities of the home so highly as did the Hebrews: but the Hebrews were not always so. Abraham and his Hagar, Jacob and his four wives, David and his Bathsheba, Solomon and his harem of a thousand women, do not indicate that the early Hebrews cared more for domestic purity than the early Greeks or Romans. Their primitive laws in the book of the Covenant have nothing to say against polygamy. But, with the coming of the great prophets, the Hebrews came to be a people of exceptional domestic purity.

Notwithstanding his vices, the Hebrew people always revered Solomon, because he built the temple. His vices, however, must be rebuked, and the purity of marriage must be insisted on. That rebuke of royal vice and that insistence on

humble virtue compose the purpose of Solomon's Song. It is a song about Solomon, to his royal shame.

The heroine of the drama is the Shulamite maiden, who lives in her mountain home and loves a shepherd lad of her own class. In one of his royal progresses to his summer palace in the mountains, Solomon caught sight of this beautiful and happy peasant girl. He has her kidnapped and brought into the palace, where his court ladies strive to win her to their own disgraceful life. Their soft words and the king's enchantments are all in vain. The poor girl wanders about and bewails her absent shepherd lad. At last she escapes the gilded reprobates, finds her lover, and is welcomed home by her brothers and her mother.

Of course this drama did not stand alone as the one production of its kind in that age of literary activity. It is the single remnant that has floated down to us. It tells us that they had actors and theatres in those days, and that the prophets had succeeded in capturing and reforming the stage. It is altogether likely that the great majority of the plays were suppressed, and that this alone, because of its moral lesson, gained the favor of endurance.

---

### *Wisdom Literature.*

In all ages there are men of practical worldly thought, keen observers of character and conduct, men of moral conviction, who are yet entirely dissociated from religious observances and theories. They may not be atheists nor materialists, but their religious belief, if they have any, is given no special place or force in their estimate of life in this world. Their standpoint is *now*; they study *actions*; they see *results*; they seek what is *wise*—not present policy or gain, but worldly wisdom. They proclaim those methods—in the home, in society, in business, in politics, that support character, make a worthy reputation, build up the public virtue, insure an honorable success. Such men are wide awake to the foibles, faults, hypocrisies, assumptions and cant of the world; and with their sturdy ethical demands they are likely to mingle a heavy spicing of ridicule. *Proverbs* and *Ecclesiastes* are the chief remnants which have come down to

us of this old-time wisdom literature. These books cover a period of several centuries. A portion of Proverbs only belongs to the eighth century. Chapters x: 1, to xxii: 16, compose the earliest collection. Of course these bright, pithy, profound sayings are a *collection*; the author simply put them into a versified or metrical form. He doubtless gathered them from all the literature of his acquaintance, as Allibone and Brewer and others have gathered their books of quotations. He also copied from oral tradition, folk lore, popular sayings. The Hebrews, as a people, then as now, were peculiar for their incisive observations of character and conduct. A people whose outward ambitions were so constantly foiled would naturally become a keen-witted people—shrewd, critical and somewhat cynical. Give the Irish a few generations of great commercial and military success, and they will become as stolid as the English.

This oldest collection of proverbs is dedicated to Solomon. (x: 1.) The collector had no design of imposing Solomon as the author of them all. He may have been the author of some. The licentious king had a reputation for seizing upon and using the weaknesses of people. He recognized heathen religions, not in the broad spirit of charity, but as a political measure. He exercised very quick wit in finding out the real mother of a child whose parentage was in dispute. He may have made proverbs—but not by the thousand. He had the reputation for a certain kind of shrewd worldly wisdom. From this dedication of a wisdom-book to his name his reputation as the “wise man” rapidly grew and exaggerated in all directions, till we have him not only as the author of all Proverbs, and Ecclesiastes, but as religiously wise and praying at the Temple’s dedication for nothing but wisdom. Thus does the ideal of a man grow and become a wondrous thing centuries after the man is dead. One or two memories concerning a prominent character are seed, in the popular thought, for an exuberant harvest.

This proverb collector was also influenced by the great reform zeal of the prophets. What we may properly call the first book of Proverbs—x: to xxii: 16—is a book of moral wisdom. It teaches that good conduct is wise; that honesty, in the long

run, is policy; that selfishness is self-defeat; that hypocrisy does not conceal fraud; that lies betray their own falsity; that deceit ensnares the deceiver; that "the Devil is an ass." Duty and conscience and lofty enthusiasms and ideal purposes and the voice of God and the spirit of self-sacrifice are not appealed to. It is *wise to do right.*

---

### *Poetry.*

David's reputation as a psalm-writer sprang from some seed of tradition in these later centuries and grew to a proportion which rivaled Solomon's wisdom. It is not at all probable that David's posthumous reputation has as much historic ground as Solomon's. It is well-nigh impossible that he composed any of the psalms of our Bible. It is very difficult to trace the origin of any complete psalm farther back than the eighth century—three hundred years after the death of David. A few may be earlier. The great majority are later. Such psalms as the third, fourth, fifth, eleventh, twentieth, twenty-first and twenty-second read like the prophetic utterances of Micah. They represent the threatened and afflicted nation as a man in deep trouble, whose virtue God will reward when the enemies are driven back. The exhortations to purity, steadfastness, trust in God; the awful sense of impending doom and scourging; the scathing rebukes of formalism, hypocrisy and unrighteous policy, apply with great force to the period of the prophets, when the very existence of both kingdoms was threatened, and "Israel" was actually being ruined.

---

### *The Decalogue.*

The Ten Commandments are found in Deut. v. and in Ex. xx. There are slight differences which indicate separate authors, if not something more. In Deuteronomy we read: "*Observe the Sabbath.*" In Exodus we have: "*Remember the Sabbath.*" "*Observe*" has the look of an original promulgation. "*Remember*" carries our thought back to a former promulgation. In Deuteronomy the phrase occurs, and is repeated: "As Jahveh thy god commanded thee." This carries the mind

back to the tradition that Jahveh had *spoken*—inclines us to feel that this was the original *writing*. The absence of that phrase in the Exodus version, coupled with the use of the word “remember,” may be accounted for on the supposition that Exodus was much later, and that it was based on this prior writing of the same set of laws. In Deuteronomy we also read, concerning the command to keep the Sabbath: “That thy man servant and thy maid servant may rest, as well as thou.” The absence of this phrase from Exodus may indicate that a time was come when servants had less the character of slaves and more the character of citizens; which would make the special urgency in their behalf not only needless but somewhat offensive. Another significant phrase of Deuteronomy which is omitted in Exodus is found in the command to honor father and mother—“That it may go well with thee.” That voices the prophetic belief of the eighth century in physical blessing as the direct result of moral feeling. That belief changed before the Decalogue of Exodus was written, and the phrase implying it was carefully left out.

The special things, however, which indicate different authors and different dates for these two versions of the moral law, are the different reasons given for keeping the Sabbath. Deut. v:15, sanctifies the Sabbath because on that day of the week Jahveh delivered the Israelites from Egypt. Ex. xx:11, sanctifies the Sabbath because God rested from his work of creation on that day. This reason is also given in Gen. ii:3. Such discrepancy can only be accounted for by a long lapse of time and the development of new theories. The Decalogue of Exodus is a much later document than the Decalogue of Deuteronomy —three centuries later, perhaps.

The original legislation concerning the Sabbath is found in that primitive code of Tribal laws, The Covenant. (Ex. xxi. to xxiii:19.) In xxiii:12, the old tribal chiefs simply declared that the seventh day should be a day of rest. It was not then a holy day—it was a mere holiday. It was not then a day of worship, not a sacred day, was not called the Sabbath. It was a simple secular rest day. They had holy days in that Tribal time, but they were anniversaries, (xxiii: 14-17.) Not having any Sabbath of worship, of course they gave no reason why it

should be sanctified. Reasons for a sacred day are generally found long after the day has slowly and unconsciously evolved its sacredness out of casual events and gradually developing customs.

The week is a natural division of time. It corresponds, practically, with the quarter-moon. The Canaanites, whose language and some of whose customs the Hebrews adopted, had this natural division of time, measured by the four phases of the moon. The Chaldeans, and, it seems, all Semitic peoples—the Arabians included—had this method of reckoning. This natural division of time, the week of seven days, is the origin of more things than the unstudious ever dreamed. The number *seven*, so significant in Hebrew literature, borrowed all its mystery from the quarter-moon. Upon that simple division into sevens, presented by the week, the whole great structure of Hebrew ritualism and ceremonial observance was erected. Everything went by sevens. The late account of creation, (Gen. i : 1 to ii : 4,) was cast into this poetic mould, and made to correspond with the week of seven days. That was an idea so bold and so grand that the final editors of the Old Testament deemed it worthy of the very first place in Hebrew literature; and so, discarding all claims of date in authorship, they placed it at the beginning of their Bible.

It was perfectly natural that one day of the seven should be set apart as a day of rest. It was natural that a thrifty people like the Hebrews should work first and rest afterward. Their spirit of energy suggested the last day of the recurring period as the holiday. In this arrangement the old chiefs of the Tribal time showed their business principles. It was perfectly natural that, as the Hebrews became more and more of a religious people, their holiday should be slowly transformed into a holy day. It was altogether natural, when the Temple was built and a priesthood began to form, that the day of rest should come to be a day of stated worship. Many centuries after that, when the first chapter of Genesis was written, it was the most natural thing in the world that the writer should ascribe to God the day of rest which man had so long observed. Do we not always ascribe our own best things—customs or

thoughts or feelings—to God? As time goes on we imagine that the origin was not with us, but with him.

If you compare the Covenant with the Decalogue you cannot escape the fact that the latter is a wondrous moral improvement upon the former. Instead of a harsh penalty attached to the *cursing* of father or mother, we have the Gospel-like exhortation to *honor* father and mother. Instead of severe punishment for certain base forms of sensuality, we have the higher, nobler, wide-sweeping, brief, delicately expressed seventh command. Instead of the blunt death sentence for worshiping other gods, we have the lengthened and reverent argument for worshiping Jahveh. The negative and cruel spirit of the Covenant gives large place to an affirmative and inspiring spirit in the Decalogue. The affirming spirit of the Gospel is not reached, but we have a long step toward it. There is a great lifting upward from barbarian threats to moral aspirations. This change could only be accomplished by the slowly civilizing processes of time. We must come this side of the Tribal Period, this side of Samuel's killing of Agag and David's destruction of Uriah and the sons of Saul, before the great command, "Thou shalt not kill," could be properly appreciated. We must come this side of Solomon for any deep appreciation of the seventh command.

Indeed, the moral tone of the Decalogue will fit no period of Hebrew history prior to the era of the prophets. That this great, brief code was a gradual formation is altogether probable. It may have grown from slight beginnings and by slow additions—often re-cast and simplified, until the present form, as we have it in Deuteronomy, was at last the universally recognized form. We cannot be far out of the way if we date the Decalogue of Deuteronomy somewhere in the eighth century and credit the great ethical prophets with its ultimate formulating. The "Tables of Stone," and all the other traditions which gathered about its miraculous origin and its ancient history, may simply be regarded as traditions.

*The Hexateuch.*

The earliest written history of Hebrew literature, of which we can speak with any definiteness, was "*The Wars of Jahveh*," mentioned in Numbers xxi: 14. That old book perhaps began with Moses and ended with David, and was simply a recital of the exploits of those ancient martial heroes. The substance of it was incorporated in Judges and Samuel, though perhaps in Joshua and the Pentateuch also some use was made of its older portions. The book itself became extinct when these larger histories were written.

There must have been other documents from which the great unknown historian of the eighth century drew, for the earliest parts of the Pentateuch, but they are irretrievably lost and wholly forgotten. The separate hero-stories, of Moses, Joseph, Abraham, Noah, and the older traditions reaching back to Adam, must have been separately wrought out, not only as oral accounts, but into written form, and long familiar, before they were gathered up and re-cast upon the framework supplied by the eighth century historian. This, however, seems to be a fact,—that no connected and continuous recital of the ancient history, from Adam to the Conquest of Canaan, was written until the eighth century.

It is here that we enter upon the most difficult problem of Hebrew literature. If it could merely be said that the Pentateuch and Joshua were written in the eighth century, by some one who fused the oral traditions and documents of his day, with the fire of his own moral enthusiasm, into this great Hexateuch as it now stands—then the problem were simple. But that cannot be said. These six books (Pentateuch and Joshua), are not the work of one hand, nor of one time. In the eighth century the history of that old period was written. *In the fifth century* it was again written from a different standpoint. The eighth century history was a distinctly literary production, with a moral purpose, influenced by the prophet spirit of the time. The fifth century history was a priestly production, with an ecclesiastical and ritualistic purpose, influenced by the spirit of Ezra and Nehemiah. These two histories were then blended, dove-tailed, braided, paragraph by paragraph, into one. How to separate them, untangle

them, and lay the two accounts side by side as separate books, has been the complex, but at last successful, work of modern scholars.

Before an indication of that great work is given, we must make certain important subtractions, that we may see just what the braid consists of. *The Covenant* (Ex. xxi. to xxiii.: 19,) must be put aside as a separate book. *Jacob's Blessing* (Gen. xlix.,) must be left out as another distinct book. *The Decalogue* also stands by itself as a complete production. What is known as "*The Law of Holiness*," comprising ten chapters of Leviticus, (xvii. to xxvi., inclusive,) is also a complete book within itself, and belongs to a time and an occasion hereafter to be considered. Then the entire book of Deuteronomy, with the exception of the Decalogue and the dying *Song of Moses* and a few other small paragraphs contained in it, is to be put aside, as the complete production of a still different time. All of these were bodily incorporated by the editor who at last moulded the Hexateuch into its present shape. After making all these subtractions we can apply ourselves to the problem of unbraiding the double history, and may arrive at some rational view of what was written in the eighth century. This so-called "Hexateuch" is practically a pentateuch with Deuteronomy dropped out and Joshua substituted.

---

### *Double Authorship.*

The most casual reader notes that the first two chapters of Genesis contain two distinct accounts of creation. The second chapter should commence with verse 4. That verse is the beginning of the eighth century history. The account of creation in Gen. i: 1, to ii: 3, inclusive, is by the writer of the fifth century. Chapter ii. represents the original earth as dry and parched: chapter i. represents it as a chaos covered with water. According to the second chapter, man was first created, then plants, then animals, then woman: while the first chapter gives the more scientific order—plants, animals, man and woman together. The second chapter tells us distinctly that one man and one woman were created: while the first chapter, with latitude for wider thinking, simply says: "Male and

female created He them." The second chapter represents the creation of the earth and the heavens as the work of one day: while the first chapter divides creation into six days of successive labor, with a day of rest. The second chapter has a very man-like conception of Deity—the Lord is pictured as working like a carpenter or a sculptor; as walking, talking, breathing, calling aloud; a being from whom Adam can hide among the bushes; a being who cannot look forward a single day and see what will come to pass: while the first chapter had a thought of God that is lofty and spiritual. He speaks from out the heavens, and the earth and the stars appear. All through the second chapter the thought is on a lower plane, which is conclusive evidence that it was written first. The more spiritual ideas of God came later. There had been a great intellectual development in Hebrew life between the writing of the second and the first chapters of Genesis. The writer who could say that the primitive earth was dry and that man appeared before animals and plants, had no faintest conception of science. When a writer states that the primitive earth was a waste of water one is inclined to suspect that he had some acquaintance with the early Greek philosophers. Those two theories of geography—the dry theory and the wet theory—the one assuming that all unknown parts of the earth were land, the other assuming that all unknown parts were water—those two theories can be traced right down through all geographical writing, from the early Greek authors to the European map-makers of the sixteenth century. Always and everywhere the more thoughtful have held to the water theory. There is no reason why the author of the first chapter should not have known something of Greek speculation on this subject. Thales, Anaximander and Pythagoras had all given their teachings from one to two centuries before this book was written.

The difference of style and thought in these first two chapters was a key with which modern scholars unlocked the problem of double authorship. As they looked carefully they found double accounts of several of the principal events in the book of Genesis. They found everywhere the same characteristic difference of style and thought. One writer has the style

and thought of the eighth century prophets ; the other has the style and thought of the fifth century priests.

When we come to the account of the Flood, the eighth century historian tells us, (Gen. vii. : 2,) that Noah took into the ark of "clean" beasts seven pairs each : of "unclean," one pair each. The fifth century historian tells us, (Gen. vi. : 19,) that of all he took one pair each. The fifth century writer, who was likely a temple priest, is not willing to confess that Noah had been instructed as to the sacramental difference between "clean" and "unclean." He is intent on making Moses the ecclesiastical law-giver, the great founder of the priesthood. He pushes every ceremonial back to Moses, but will only allow the most general ordinances to go farther, if he can help it.

Having become sufficiently acquainted with the characteristics of these two writers to unbraid the book of Genesis, the critics proceeded with their work, making the careful division of Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers and Joshua. It will be convenient to designate the writer of the eighth century B. C. as the *Prophet-historian*, and the writer of the fifth century B. C. as the *Priest-historian*.

---

### *The Prophet-Historian.*

The eighth century historian, as we might expect him to be in that age when the prophets were reforming everything, was a reformer. He writes history with a purpose. His purpose is to teach morality and providence, to account for everything on moral and providential grounds. He compels every event to preach a sermon, in which the good man, or the penitent man, or the man divinely selected for a mission, is miraculously blessed of Jahveh. He believed with the prophets that all forms of human suffering and all forms of evil in nature are due directly to somebody's crime. Everything in the world that is not good and happy must be referred to human sin.

His first care is to explain how men became sinners. For that explanation he borrowed the Persian story of the Garden. He is not prepared to bring in the philosophy of Dualism, with Persia's two gods ; he could not thus abandon the staunch

Hebrew monotheism; and so he makes use of a serpent—intimating that originally the serpent was a different kind of a creature, which was humiliated from its exalted state and made a crawling creature, by the curse that was put upon it. But the gist of the story is human disobedience to Jahveh's command.

He then proceeds to give a moral reason for the presence of briars and thistles on the earth, and why it is that people must work for a living. It was because man sinned. The peculiar and especial sufferings of woman, and the fact that she is weaker than man, and in so much of human history has been the slave of man, are all accounted for on the supposition that Eve was the first to sin.

In the story of Cain and Abel this Prophet-historian pictures a further calamity of disobedience. Jahveh's command was that men offer *animals* in worship. *Fruit* was under ban since Eve's experience. Cain was a gardener, had no animals to sacrifice, and did not appreciate the seriousness of the fruit episode sufficiently to provide himself. His fruit offering was a disobedience, for which Jahveh rebuked him, and Cain fell into a mortal jealousy of his brother.

The tradition of a Flood was the common property of Semitic races. It was doubtless the lingering memory, through measureless ages, of the real old geological floods of the glacier period. Our Prophet-historian accounted for it on moral grounds. The Flood, also, was a Divine rebuke of human wickedness.

Another thing to be accounted for was the differing speech of men. Every nation had its own language, and that fact created no end of difficulty, required study—study is work—work is evil. The Prophet-historian had an explanation. He adapted or invented the story of Babel, with the selfish ambition of the forefathers which was rebuked by the "confusion of tongues." Of course, the Priest-historian says nothing about that, for before he wrote the Jews had been in the land of Shinar, (Babylonia), and learned that the Tower was without foundation.

The picturesque stories of the patriarchs, those detailed "lives" of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, stories that are brimming with energy and sparkling with "lessons," many of them

beautiful, some of them pathetic, all of them written with a devout purpose, in which events must be clearly subservient to ideas, are from the pen of the Prophet-historian. The account (Gen. xviii) of the appearance of the Lord at Abraham's tent, the promise concerning Sarah's child, and the supper with the celestial guests, is what may properly be called graphic writing. The same account by the Priest-historian, (Gen. xvii : 15 to 19,) is not graphic, it is a prosaic and solemn statement. It is thus the two historians always differ. The detailed and exciting narrative of the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, (Gen. xviii : 16—xix : 28,) is from the Prophet-historian. The Priest-historian contents himself with a bare reference, (Gen. xix : 29.) It is the Prophet-historian who gives the beautiful love-story of the bringing of Isaac's wife, (ch. xxiv); the prophetic births of Jacob and Esau, (ch. xxv); the narrative of Jacob's subterfuge, (ch. xxvii); the account of Jacob's happy finding of Rachel, (ch. xxix); and the lively recital of Jacob's experience with Laban, (ch. xxx). All through these stories the Deity is represented, very crudely, as an angel who comes down from his upper abode, and walks on the earth, and argues with men; who sits at the tent door in the cool of the evening, and eats, and is pleased with the smell of burning sacrifices; who needs to make inquiry to find out if reports are true, and is turned from a sworn resolve by the influence of a man. It reads like Homer's account of the actions and feelings of a Greek god. It was written in the age of Homer.

This Prophet-historian was a writer with free swinging rhetoric, with keen wit and full emotion, in whose mind every old scrap of tradition rounded out into a well-balanced and deeply interesting story, with miracles galore, with tragic situations and breathless crises and grand denuements to satisfy the most exacting. The stories are not hurried, but the action is brisk enough for a drama, and the reader is carried delightfully from scene to scene without the introduction of a needless word. Every paragraph is brilliant with changing effects and great sayings.

The story of Joseph and Moses, of how the Hebrews got into Egypt and how they got away, is one of the most delightful and unhistoric, one of the most ingenious because so ap-

parently ingenuous, that was ever written. There is nothing in Homer to surpass it for noble imagery and poetic completeness, and Homer cannot be compared with it for naturalness of presentation and elevation of sentiment. It has the charm of a pastoral woven about the rugged grandeur of an epic. Facts of history and facts of science are equally unknown to this entrancing story-teller. His facile pen is never embarrassed by physical realities or any awkward demand of logic. He was illustrating the prophetic idea of morals and providence. The clay of tradition, so plastic under his happy touch, was moulded into shapes of beauty which can never lose their charm nor fail of arousing the world's reverent sympathy.

From the crossing of the Red Sea to the conquest of Canaan, as in all the earlier parts of the Hexateuch, the *stories* largely belong to the Prophet-historian; the ritualism to the Priest-historian, three centuries later. The Song of Victory, (Ex. xv: 1-19,) may have been copied from the *Book of Jasher*. The healing of bitter waters (ch. xv: 22-26); the complaint against Moses (xvi: 1-3); the institutions of the Sabbath, which tradition pushed back to this fictitious date (xvi: 27-30); the battle with Amalek (xvii: 8-16); the story of Jethro, (xviii); the story of Sinai (xix); the story of the Golden Calf (xxxii: 18—xxxii: 35); the story of Jahveh's appearance to Moses (xxxiii: 12-23); are from the pen of the Prophet-historian.

The last six chapters of Exodus, all of Leviticus, with the exception of the *Law of Holiness* (chs. xvii-xxvi), and to Numbers xiii: 17, belong to the Priest's code of the second Temple.

The story of the spies (Num. xiii: 17-33); the prayer of Moses and Jahveh's reply (xiv: 11-24); the story of the Ark (xiv: 40-45); the story of Korah and his fellow-rebels (xvi: 1-3; 12-15; 25-34); the smiting of the rock (xx: 3-5; 7-11); the messengers to Edom (xx: 14-21); the fiery serpent (xxi: 4-9); the battle with the Amorites (xxi: 12.35); the story of Balak and Balaam (xxii-xxiv); the preparations for conquest (xxxii), comprise the eighth century historian's part of the book of Numbers.

From his writing it is supposed that the author of Deuteronomy took the command (Deut. xxv: 5-7), to build a rough

stone altar and feast about it, and rejoice, while they offered sacrifices to Jahveh. That was very unlike the extended ritualism of the mythical Tabernacle, which the Priest-historian erects for these primitive times. The account of Moses' approaching death, and his dying song, (Deut. xxxi: 16-21; and xxxi: 30—xxxii: 43,) are also reckoned as having been taken from the Prophet-historian, who contented himself with nothing further about Moses, except the simple sublime epitaph of Deut. xxxiv: 10. This dying song of Moses was probably an independent production, copied by the Prophet-historian.

The book of Joshua consists of twenty-four chapters. The first twelve, devoted to the Conquest, are almost entirely by the Prophet-historian. The other twelve, devoted to the division of the spoil and Joshua's final exhortations, are almost wholly the work of the Priest-historian.

Whoever would like to make a closer study of this problem of double authorship will find the exhaustive analysis, from which I have taken this hasty outline, in Dr. Driver's *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*. He will find the problem still further complicated by the theory that this Prophet-history is itself a book of double authorship; but, since it is very likely that the two writings and their combination all date in the eighth century, they may be thus considered as one. These two authors of the eighth century work are commonly known as *Jehovist* and *Elohist*; but to avoid so much technicality I have used the term Prophet-history.

Every student, every one who even pretends to be a Bible reader, should be familiar with the distinctions between this eighth century work and the Priest-code (or Priest-history), which was written three centuries later and braided with it.

If the reader will get two cheap copies of the Bible, so that he can use both sides of the leaves, and cut out all the story parts as here indicated, with the connecting paragraphs or verses so clearly determined by Dr. Driver, and paste them in order in a blank book, he will have substantially the Prophet-history. He will be surprised to find what a complete story it is, how many of the breaks and jumps and doublings and disconnections and misunderstandings of the common version it

avoids. He will be surprised to find how little ritualism it contains; for it will be impressed upon his mind that *The Tabernacle*, with its endless laws and ordinances, had not yet been invented.

---

### *Later History.*

It hardly seems probable that the historians of that great literary age (the 8th century B. C.) would pause with the conquest of Canaan; but there is no other historic writing of that age existent. We have reference, however, to other books now extinct, upon which the later histories of *Samuel* and *Kings* were doubtless founded. The eighth century writers seem to have considered the *The Wars of Jahveh* and the *Book of Jasher* sufficient for the period of the Judges and Saul and David. For the age of Solomon, 1st Kings, xi : 41, refers to a book called the *Acts of Solomon*. That was very likely a history of the great Temple Epoch written in the eighth century. The history of the northern kingdom, down almost to his own time, was also (probably) written by some eighth century historian, in the book so often mentioned both in 1st and 2d Kings, and which was called *The Chronicles of The Kings of Israel*. (See 1st Kings, xiv : 19; 2d Kings, xiv : 28.) The history of the southern kingdom, probably compiled in the eighth century, quite as often mentioned, is called *The Chronicles of The Kings of Judah*. (See 1st Kings, xiv : 29; 2d Kings, xx : 20.)

Those portions of the Old Testament which we now possess that were in existence at the year 700 B. C. are: *Jacob's Blessing*; the *Covenant*; the *Decalogue*; *Amos*; *Hosea*; the first *Isaiah*; *Micah*; the *Song of Solomon*; a few *Psalms*; the first collections of *Proverbs*; *The Dying Song of Moses*; the *Prophet-history* of the Hexateuch; and such matter from the *Wars of Jahveh* and the book of *Jasher* and the *Acts of Solomon* and the *Chronicles of the Kings of Israel* and the *Chronicles of the Kings of Judah*, as has been incorporated in *Judges*, 1st and 2d *Samuel*, and 1st and 2d *Kings*.

## CHAPTER V.

## JUDAH.

*Growth of The Jewish Priesthood.*

The destruction of Israel was completed by the Assyrians in the year 721 B. C. The last of the great ethical prophets died with Isaiah about the year 700. Henceforth, during a period of seventy-five years, literature stagnated. If anything was written during that period, it has been lost. Perhaps much was written—nothing great enough to live. Great literature goes by historic epochs. When an epoch passes, nothing great is written until popular thought is centered upon some new problem. The old prophetic order of thought came to an end with Isaiah. The great idea of the eighth century had been the belief in political providence as the reward of popular morality—the belief that if people were moral, and for that reason alone, God would give them national prosperity. With that sublime, though mistaken, conviction the prophets had worked great moral reforms; but political greatness did not follow—scourging and destruction followed. On the heels of their splendid reforms came the utter defeat and practical annihilation of the northern kingdom. Ten of the twelve tribes were blotted out of existence. The other two tribes were made an Assyrian province, paying tribute for their lives. Never had the Hebrews risen to such high ethical standards; never had their moral sense, their conduct, their domestic relations, been so commendable; never had calamity so sweeping and so fatal come upon them. Moral reform had not secured the defeat of their enemies. God had not come to the rescue; had not answered their nobler living with military victories, but with the most dreadful losses of life and territory and liberty. Appreciating the failure of the prophet-theory of national progress, to whom should the

people turn but to the priests? The prophets had not been careless of worship, but they had been so overwhelmingly zealous for good conduct that it *seemed* they were careless of worship. A multitude usually sees but one thing at a time. To make any matter of *less* importance, seems to make it of *no* importance in the eyes of a multitude. The prophets had severely criticised the deadness and formalism of priestly routine. The multitude does not distinguish between the abuses allowed by an organization and the organization itself. It *seemed* that the prophets meant to destroy the priesthood—that the prophets had no regard for any system of worship whatever. When calamity came under the prophet rule, the priests were ready to make the most of it. Financial distress may be owing to a failure of crops, but the party that is out will try to make the dear people believe that the party in power was entirely responsible. Political calamity, at the close of two generations of prophetic rule, was the priests' opportunity. The terrible facts of defeat and conquest and disruption were plain enough. The politician is always ready with his plausible theory of the facts. The people had trusted the prophets and were now in distress. They would try the priests. Perhaps God was angry because the forms of worship had been neglected? That was the priests' explanation. The people were inclined to believe it.

King Hezekiah, not long after the fall of Israel, noting the strong demand for a change of policy, anticipating the relapse of popular sentiment, began the work of *ecclesiastical* reform. He not only inveighed against idolatry, destroying the heathen shrines and images, but he made a deadly crusade on the images of Jahveh, for the Ten Commandments were still comparatively new, and the Hebrews still made images of their god. That semblance of idolatry should be rooted up. This wholesale destruction of Hebrew idols in all the villages round about, had the effect to reduce the power of the village priests, and to enlarge the power of the Temple priesthood. Hezekiah then refitted the Temple itself; elaborated the ceremonies; made Jerusalem more strictly and strikingly the centre of worship, as Solomon had done. Like Solomon, however, he recognized the existence of local sanctuaries. Hezekiah

moved carefully. He would still allow neighborhood worship and recognize the neighborhood priests; but he would prohibit the use of images while he conferred greater importance and honors on the Temple priesthood.

That was the beginning of the new order. The priesthood steadily grew, and was destined to become the governing power, and eventually the sole political power in the nation. For the next three-quarters of a century the change gradually took place. Priests, instead of prophets, were the popular leaders and the king's advisers. The people were slowly converted to the idea that the most important thing was worship, the safest thing, the thing most likely to insure Divine favor.

About the year 625 B. C., the young and ardent King Josiah, a thorough convert to the new order, felt himself in position to make the final stroke. The people still had their local places of worship and their neighborhood priests. That was not satisfactory to the young king. A youthful, ambitious king, who believes in priests at all, wants a closely-organized priesthood, which holds the consciences of the people in its grasp, and whose emoluments he holds in his own grasp. Josiah appreciated that political failure had been largely due to a lack of organization. He saw that the only means of organization was the Temple priesthood. Through that he could govern, and he meant to govern wisely and well, for his ambitions were all of a noble and worthy kind.

Josiah determined to utterly destroy the places of local worship, to do away with the village priests, to make Jerusalem the only place of worship, and lift the Temple priesthood into supreme religious authority. That was a bold and dangerous undertaking. The villagers would not easily give up the sacred shrines about which they gathered on the Sabbath day. They would not readily part with the priests, their neighbors and friends, who ministered at the altar and ministered in their homes at wedding and funeral. It was to deprive the nation of its home religion and establish a national service. It was to destroy their weekly gatherings and shut them off from all religious exercise, except as they might travel to Jerusalem and worship with strangers. No king could reasonably expect that his people were so devoted to him as to make that sacrifice. If he

forced such a measure upon them, he could only look for open rebellion. To abolish, at one fell stroke, the churches, the religious order, the sacred associations, the inherited customs, of a nation, is more than any sane king, unless peculiarly provided for the emergency, would undertake. Josiah had devised a scheme by which he felt equal to this radical and highly dangerous proceeding.

---

### *The Book of Deuteronomy.*

Josiah was not alone in devising and accomplishing this revolution. There were two others who acted with him in perfect concert and perfect sympathy and perfect secrecy. The high priest and the chief scribe were essential to the success of one of the bravest schemes by which the destinies of a nation were ever determined. The high priest was the venerable and honored Hilkiah. Shaphan was chief scribe. Kuenen suggests that a fourth person, Hilkiah's brilliant son, the so-called "prophet" Jeremiah, was also in the secret. The scheme was to write a code of laws, moral and ecclesiastical—a code in which their pet measure was emphatically proclaimed—and then spring that code upon the people in such way as to give it the force of an ancient and Divine command.

The Temple was in a sad state of repair, and was heaped with rubbish. Neglected corners had accumulated the refuse of two generations. The new code was written. It is quite possible that Jeremiah's talents were engaged with Hilkiah's in that great work. They dictated: Shaphan wrote and edited. They dated their work back seven centuries, attributing it to Moses. They chose the end of that great leader's career as the time. They made him utter this book as a dying exhortation to his people. All the accessories were duly and skillfully arranged. It was a stroke of genius. When completed, the book was carefully hidden among the dust and mould and rubbish of the most neglected corner in the Temple. When the time was ripe for action, Hilkiah "discovered" it; sought an occasion when the chief scribe was surrounded by his friends and told him of his wonderful "find." Shaphan must read it himself in order to be con-

vinced. People were not close critics then. The newness of the parchment could easily be kept from them. Such a sacred "find" must only be handled by those in authority. When the doubtful Shaphan read it in secret, and told his fellow scribes and priests that he was convinced, they accepted his testimony. Shaphan then took the writing to the king, and the king acted his part well. It was so easy for the king to keep the original and have a copy made for public use! There was a certain woman, Huldah, of great and pious influence, who was closely related to the royal household—a sort of court lady and blessed Saint Catharine in one—and she was made use of to win the initial assent of the multitude. All the better if she were not in the secret, if she were an honest convert to this miraculous providence. Huldah uttered a solemn word on the matter which had immense weight with the people. (See 2d Kings, xxii.) The elders and the prominent men were assembled in the king's presence, and the book was read, and the king played his own astonishment so nobly that the pious fraud was not detected. The elders, and then the people, accepted this book verily as an ancient, lost, and found, document, whose original words had been spoken by Moses at the direct command of God. On the popular acceptance of such authority, Josiah proceeded with his ecclesiastical revolution.

Hilkiah's book is our book of Deuteronomy. Some additions have since been made, but the body of the work is the same. It is one of the noblest, in many regards the greatest and best, of the Old Testament collection—finely moral, deeply reverential, bravely patriotic, full of political and practical wisdom, aspiring and inspiring. As a book of morals, it pleads for justice to the weak, fairness to the enslaved, generosity to servants and strangers. It abrogates the old barbarism of punishing the family of a criminal with him; it moderates physical penalties; denounces usury and all manner of cheating; exhorts kindness and fraternity; guards the rights of property; provides legal redress; sanctifies the home; protects woman; inveighs against slander and sensuality, and in every regard is a magnificent testimony to the moral sense and good purpose of its authors.

As an ecclesiastical code, it lays great stress upon the requirement that worship shall be conducted only at one central and consecrated shrine; it crushes every form of idolatry; denounces images of Jahveh as themselves idolatrous; provides for annual pilgrimages to the consecrated altar; elevates the ministering priests of the altar to membership in the nation's court of final appeal, and makes their word and person sacred. Priests are limited to the tribe of Levi; they are to be separated from the people and form a distinct class; their living is provided at public expense; if the country priests will come up to the central shrine, they shall still be recognized as priests and provided for in the legal community of the priesthood—otherwise they shall be held as outlaws. Thus was the priestly order established on a firm and enduring basis. The nation and the religion were united, and the priesthood was become an integral part of the government.

The people bowed sorrowfully but submissively to this law, which they regarded as God's ancient word, long forgotten; and the work of destruction proceeded. The village altars were torn down and the rebellious priests were killed. The Temple was repaired, re-decorated, and the solemn service again took on a new grandeur. Then a great religious jubilee was held, and the new régime was gloriously established.

---

The shrewdest and wittiest thing in the book of Deuteronomy, if not in the entire Bible; a brilliant, captivating, knock-down argument which it were difficult to parallel anywhere, is that question and answer in the last two verses of chapter xviii. "And if thou say in thine heart, how shall we know the word which the Lord hath *not* spoken? . . . . When a prophet speaketh in the name of the Lord, if the thing follow not, nor come to pass, that is the thing which the Lord hath not spoken; but the prophet hath spoken it presumptuously: thou shalt not be afraid of him."

The priestly authors of Deuteronomy are anxious to maintain the *principle* of inspiration. They are even anxious to have it believed that prophets, as well as priests, are inspired. The prophets were held in great honor. The very word, prophet, was reverenced, notwithstanding the mistake of theory

which the great prophets had made. The names of Isaiah and Micah and Amos and Hosea were honored and beloved, as were the names of David and Moses. These priestly authors of Deuteronomy would not array themselves against that popular devotion to great and reverenced names. They adopted that common sentiment, paid it court, and pleased the people by making Moses declare himself not only as the author of the priesthood, but also as God's great first prophet. It was in the character of a prophet they compelled Moses to utter this noble book they had written. Moreover, young Jeremiah assumed the double role of priest-prophet. Son of the high priest, joint author, mayhap, of Deuteronomy, he called himself a prophet. It was probably to himself that Jeremiah secretly referred when he suggested the fifteenth verse of this chapter xviii. All the dignity and devotion and Divine authority and popular reverence in that word *prophet* should be turned to account in establishing the new priestly order.

The people must be made to understand, however, that the great prophets had been mistaken in one essential regard. The prophets had assumed, and were commonly believed, to have spoken by Divine command. That *principle* must be sacredly maintained; for Jeremiah, as a prophet, meant to uphold this priestly code of his father's and his own construction. But a line of distinction must be drawn. The great prophets had persistently said one thing that was a mistake—their theory of national greatness as the Divine reward of simple morality. It must be shown that the great prophets did not always speak by inspiration; that they sometimes transcended the bounds and spake their own thoughts, presumptuously. Hilkiah and Jeremiah made a rule by which the common people could determine for themselves the particular things, in any prophetic utterance, which were *not* spoken by the Lord. What a plain, grand, keen, sarcastic rule of judgment they made! “Wait, and see whether the thing comes to pass: if it does, the prophet was inspired; if it does not, the prophet spake presumptuously.” Jeremiah did not appreciate what a sarcasm that would come to be on some of his own later predictions: notably, his prediction, twenty years afterward, of the restoration of the ten tribes. Few speakers or

writers ever do appreciate that their keenest rule of judgment is likely to prove a two-edged sword.

What an effectual shutting off this was of all prophesy that related to a distant future! If any prediction was laid a hundred years in advance, with what irony would the people say: "We shall wait, and see if the thing come to pass, before we accept it as a word the Lord hath spoken." How extremely witty the rule becomes when theologians explain what will take place in the future world—wait: "If the thing follow not, nor come to pass, it is a word which the Lord hath not spoken." Of all of this Hilkiah and Jeremiah were not thinking. They were thinking of history. They made a rule by which to test the inspiration of the prophetic utterances of the eighth and seventh centuries. It had the effect they desired. The people accepted their practical test. The things uttered by Micah and Isaiah concerning the national reward of morals had not come to pass; therefore, it was not a word which the Lord had spoken. The prophets had spoken it presumptuously. Their victory was gained and the priestly order seated on the throne of popular approval.

---

What shall we say of this scheme for giving the new code of laws a fictitious authority by ascribing it to Moses? It was a sort of military strategem. Without some such manœuvre Josiah could never have worked the revolution he desired. Popular superstition would accept and obey a law thus promulgated. Had it been announced as a new law, it would have been the signal for rebellion and massacre. Then, as now, the *ancient* was *sacred*. People believed that in the olden time God walked the earth and talked face to face with his servants. It was, as Kuenen calls it, a pious fraud, but the purpose in it was good. The king and the high priest did not do this thing for their personal gain, but for the public welfare. They saw nothing wrong in that kind of a deception. They were not shocked by any suggestion of literary "forgery" as we of the nineteenth century would be. That special feature of the moral sense was yet undeveloped. It was the year 621, exactly one hundred years after the fall of Israel, that the book of Deuteronomy was made public and the priestly revolution

effected. Josiah reigned thirteen years longer, and they were years of peace and prosperity—a Divine confirmation, in the popular estimate, of his revolutionary work.

---

*The Occasion of Other Books.*

The Assyrians, who had destroyed Israel and restricted Judah, were deeply feared and hated, looked upon as the chief enemies of God and righteousness. In the year 607 the great barbarian hero, Cyaxares, defeated the Assyrians and demolished their wonderful city of Nineveh. The book of *Zephaniah*, written in the form of a prophesy, as if before the event, is most probably a commemoration of the event. The Assyrians were growing more and more bold. Had they defeated Cyaxares they would have wrought untold havoc. Let Judah beware—God may not spare them so mercifully again; but now the hated Assyrian was laid in the dust—let Judah be thankful and faithful! The book of *Nahum* is a poem of exultation, magnificently conceived and worded, over the fall of Nineveh. It is a classic shout of joy and deliverance.

The first nine chapters of the book of *Proverbs*, what may be properly called the Second Book of Proverbs, belongs to this period. The peace that comes of wisdom, and the destruction of the enemies of righteousness, are finely pointed by the reign of Josiah and the fall of Nineveh.

---

*Jeremiah.*

This great book is a series of productions. Chapter i. is a remnant of some early discourse concerning the Assyrians. Chapters ii.-iv. are a group of exhortations against idolatry. Chapters vii.-x. are another group of discourses against unfaithfulness to the Temple worship. Chapters xi.-xii. are a plea for the sacred recognition of the book of Deuteronomy. Chapter xvii. is a plea for the sanctity of the Sabbath. Chapter xxiii. is a rebuke of the prophets who are opposed to the priestly order beloved by Jeremiah. Chapters xxx.-xxxiii. are a great unfilled prediction that Israel shall be restored. Now that Assyria is humbled, Jeremiah expects that

God will release the ten tribes and bring them back and unite them with Judah in one loving kingdom. Jeremiah's prophecies against Babylon and his predictions of its destruction were (if not entirely composed) re-written and amended and made more specific after the events took place. His predictions, in general terms, of the captivity are not improbably dated before the event. That had been threatened for many years.

After the defeat of the Assyrians, the Jews made common cause with Egypt. Nebuchadnezzar was at war with Egypt, and his victory over the Egyptian army in 604 left the Jews defenseless. The Jews paid tribute to the Babylonian monarch, but for some offence he appeared before Jerusalem in 597 and carried off many important citizens as hostages for submissive behavior. In 589 there was a revolt of the hot-heads against Babylonian rule, and then it was perfectly plain to any sensible man that Nebuchadnezzar might seal their doom any day. The fatal day came, when that monarch had leisure for so small an enterprise, in 586. The towns were demolished, Jerusalem was put to the sword, the Temple destroyed, terrible vengeance was wreaked on the king and his princes, the chief families were carried into captivity, and the kingdom which began with Saul was forever at an end.

---

### *Conflicting Theories of Providence.*

Those eleven years between the first scourging by Nebuchadnezzar and the final destruction of Jerusalem—597 to 586—were troublous times, which puzzled all thinkers and gave rise to many different theories of providence. Jeremiah looked forward to still deeper calamities, as the punishment for idolatry. Habakkuk, on the other hand, whose book was written about the year 590, believes that the nation has been punished sufficiently, and that Jahveh will now assist them to destroy all their enemies—even Nebuchadnezzar, should he again come against them. Thus did the prophets differ; and the people doubtless said: "Let us wait, and see which of these things will come to pass."

The prophetic idea of the eighth century had been that God would give national success in return for moral conduct. The

priestly idea of the seventh century had been that God would give national prosperity in return for the faithfulness of Temple worship. The preaching of the prophets and the moral reforms were followed by the destruction of Israel. The work of the priests and the ecclesiastical reforms were now to be followed by the destruction of Judah. Both theories of providence, or of securing providential favor, had failed. The old question came up afresh: "Why does God allow, or send, this terrible suffering? On what principle does God punish the nation?"

During these last years of the kingdom when utter calamity threatened, and the fate of Judah seemed as dreadful as the fate of Israel, a wonderful book was written.

Some great genius among them reasoned thus: "If punishment is not averted for the sake of morality, nor for the sake of faithful worship, then God must have an unrevealed reason for allowing men to suffer." A new theory of providence must be devised. The genius thought he had an illumination. Suffering was not, or might not be, of the nature of punishment. Suffering and punishment had always been thought of as one. Our genius made a distinction. There might be some other purpose than punishment in suffering. There might even be a kind purpose in it. Suffering might be God's way of testing and developing the virtues of men and nations. This delightful hint grew into a positive conviction and took shape in a masterpiece of literature.

Let us bring the prophet's theory of rewards and punishments clearly to mind. They were sadly mistaken, but it was a mistake of the head not of the heart. Their theory was all wrong, but they were not to blame. Nothing but science could reveal the truth of this matter, and science was unborn. Before the day of science it was impossible that men should avoid mistakes, of any and every kind, on the question of providence. The prophets believed that God rewarded and punished the private virtues and vices of people with material and political blessing or cursing. If men were pure and truthful and generous they should have abundant crops and splendid markets, with national peace and prosperity. If men were impure and selfish and cruel their crops would be blasted with frost and mildew, their flocks would be destroyed with disease,

the enemy would come upon them with disastrous war. They believed that God wielded the laws of nature arbitrarily, constantly changing the weather, introducing or averting disease, stirring up nations to plunder and bloodshed or thwarting their wicked schemes, that in these physical ways he might reward or punish the Israelites.

To people who have even a primary understanding of science, all that is very absurd, but that was the prophet's conception of providence. Everywhere and constantly the prophets appealed to these physical rewards for morality and these material calamities for vice. Sometimes, of course, the proof of their doctrine was not very clear. It often happened that when people had been especially good the crops were bad. It often happened that disease and desolation did not follow a period of moral debasement. The best men in the neighborhood were sometimes the greatest sufferers. The wickedest men were sometimes the most prosperous. The author of one of the psalms frankly confesses that he almost lost faith in God when he saw the prosperity of the wicked. Such things were hard to explain, but the prophets held on to their theory.

Then the priestly theory came in—that God rewarded faithful worship and punished idolatry. All calamities were referred to idolatry, or unfaithfulness to the established worship. For a century that theory had been growing. For twenty or thirty years it had been eloquently and constantly pleaded by Jeremiah, side by side with the prophetic theory. At last the old-time Shakespeare arose and put forth an entirely new theory of providence.

---

### *The Book of Job.*

It seems most probable that this immortal drama was written in the impending doom, when Nebuchadnezzar was likely to sweep their nation out of existence any day. It applies to the national, and equally to individual, fortunes. How we should rejoice to know the name of its author; not because his theory is half true, but because he was a man of literary genius, because he was earnest about it and so loyal to

his own conviction. Also, because he introduced a new and consolatory element of thought, lifted the common doctrine of providence to a higher level, brought it one long step on the way toward reason.

You know the story. A good man suffers calamity. Because he suffers calamity his friends conclude he is a bad man. He protests his innocence and challenges them to examine his conduct. When they find nothing wrong in his actions they declare he must have sinned secretly. When he protests the purity of his soul before God, then they conclude he must have sinned unconsciously. Of course he must be a sinner or these calamities would not have come upon him. Day after day of explanation, argument, appeal, exhortation, but neither side will budge. The friends hold to their theory, which the prophets of two centuries have been teaching. Job protests his absolute innocence. At last our author makes an explanation. He says the general rule is that suffering is punishment for sin; but this case is an exception. A really good man suffers. What then may we conclude? What was this exceptional suffering for? It was God's method of proving Job's faith, of testing his loyalty and fortitude, that by means of suffering his virtues might shine the more brightly.

That certainly was an advance on the old hard-and-fast doctrine that frost and mildew are the direct results of sin, and that prosperity is God's acknowledgment of virtue. That book, written in the very shadow of their great national calamity, gave popular hope. Perhaps God was only testing the nation's endurance and faith. If they remained true all calamities would pass by, great restoration and prosperity would come again, as in Job's case. Of course that is not scientific and it is not historic. God does not wield the forces of nature or the destinies of a dozen nations arbitrarily that may punish the sins or reward the virtues of the people in one particular nation. That new idea, however, that explanation given by the author of Job, worked a thorough and lasting revolution in the popular thought of the Jews. During all the six hundred years that follow, to the time of Christ, we find it the dominant idea in the Jewish conception of providence. Suffering henceforth had a new meaning to the Jew. It was not wrath half so

much as it was love. God was testing their faith, purifying their souls in the flame of grief; and the suffering itself was a sort of promise and pledge of greater prosperity to come. "Providence by suffering" soon came to be the popular belief. In less than a century we find the complete revolution of ideas has been worked. Instead of saying, with the old prophets, that loss and misfortune and pain are the punishments of sin, men began to say: "Whom the Lord loveth He chasteneth."

•

## CHAPTER VI.

## IN CAPTIVITY.

*The Heroism of the Priests.*

When Judah was carried into captivity the priests were the nuclei of organization, the centres of influence, the teachers and moulders of thought. They alone could hold their enslaved brethren together and make them think and act in concert. A few of the more prominent families were taken to the city of Babylon. The masses were assigned small districts of land, here and there, which they must cultivate, not only to support themselves, but to help support the king's army and his court. Ancient monarchs made financial use of their captives. In those farming districts Jews and Babylonians were free to form such friendships and social relations as they pleased. Kindly association was even encouraged. It was the policy of conquerors to make contented and loyal citizens of their captives. Out of this cordiality were two results which greatly disturbed the priests, and seriously threatened the future existence of Judaism—intermarriage with Babylonians, and desertion to Babylonian religion. The Jews had full privilege of their own religion; but that generous toleration perhaps inclined them a little more kindly toward the religion of their conquerors. Babylonia was an older, richer, more artistic and magnificent country, by far, than their own Canaanite hills; and this outward prosperity and greatness also captivated the sympathies of the less patriotic captives. The priests had their hands full of work in holding their people aloof from heathendom. The privilege of their own worship, however, was the priests' opportunity. Almost all heathen conquerors allowed captives that privilege. Christian nations set the example of denying it, and of cruelly persecuting all who would not conform to the religion of the conqueror. In whatever concerned the religion of the conquered, Christian nations have been peculiarly barbarous, while heathen nations were nobly

generous. The worst of the Roman tyrants did not persecute Christians or Christianity *per se*, they persecuted individual Christians, and then tried to stamp out the Christian religion, only because Christians were disobedient to the civil law. Rome had an established religion, which was a part of its civil procedure, to which it demanded outward and formal obedience. That obedience was made as formal and as easy on the Christian conscience as the most generous interpretation of the law could make it; but Christians regarded the lightest semblance of recognition as idolatry. The refusal to utter the name of a Roman god in making oath sowed the seeds of disloyalty and rebellion; and it was for that un-Roman and rebellious influence, not for their Christian devotion, that they were persecuted. Jews in the city of Rome, primitive Hebrews in Egypt, Jews in Babylonia, were allowed all religious freedom that any stretch of the civil law could grant them. Christian nations and Christian rulers began the systematic search for and remediless torture of personal and private non-conformity—a search and a torture that reached to the secret thoughts and feelings of individuals.

The Jews were carefully nurtured in their own faith, in the land of exile, by the priests who moved to and fro amongst them. It shows the power of priestly organization and the zeal of priestly devotion that the vast majority of Jews were kept true to their faith, in that land from which there was no reasonable hope of escape; that land in which, to all appearance, they and their descendants must forever remain as captives—until they chose to remain as converted and loyal citizens. Never were a set of priests busier, more determined, more enthusiastic, than the Jewish priests in exile. Nowhere else in human history does the name and the work of the priest shine forth more honorably. The patriot in exile is always a grand sort of man; doubly grand when he can see no way out of exile; when he holds grimly to his principles and waits and faintly hopes.

If the question is asked, why the Ten Tribes were lost, absorbed by the Assyrians, made over into citizens of the conquering nation, this is the reply: There were no priests among them of sufficient ability and influence and purpose to

hold them separate and coherent from their conquerors. They did not retain any tribal or national or religious organization. They did not keep their separateness from the heathen. They lost the sense of patriotism, lost the love of their ancestral faith, lost their Hebrew peculiarities of belief and practice, mingled with Assyrians, deserted each other, and by inter-marriages became part and parcel of Assyria, just as the children of Germans cease to be a German colony, forget their language even, and become Americans, in the forests of Michigan or on the prairie farms of Illinois. The ten "lost tribes," as if they wandered somewhere, maintaining their Israelite identity, is one of the amusing fictions of history. They did not wander; they mixed blood with the Assyrians and were absorbed. The northern kingdom was carried away before the priesthood came into power, and the prophets had no organizing and cohering ability. Had the priesthood been as deeply intrenched in Israel at 721 B.C. as it was in Judah at 586 B.C. the Ten Tribes would have been kept separate and apart from their conquerors, as the two tribes were in Babylonia, and would have returned to Canaan, at some juncture of national events, as the Jews did. Had the prophets maintained ascendancy until the year 586, the priesthood still as weak and uninfluential then as in 721, the Babylonian captivity would have been final; the Jews would have been absorbed; would have become citizens of the heathen nation, embracing the heathen religion; never would have returned to Palestine; the Hebrew name would have ceased from the earth; a great part of the Bible would never have been written; what was written would have been lost and forgotten; Jesus would never have been born, Christianity would not have existed, and the history of the world would have been very different. When Josiah and Hilkiah and Shaphan and Jeremiah worked their ecclesiastical reform, and established their book of Deuteronomy as a book of Moses, God-inspired, they had no dream of the wonderful results which waited their action. Looking back upon the absorption of the ten tribes, the priests determined that Judah should not repeat the experience, but should maintain its religious identity and its race characteristics in exile, should be kept united and distinct, on the hope that *somewhat* deliverance

might come. Whether or not they felt much of it in their own hearts, they diligently inculcated belief in deliverance, as the greatest element of its possibility. That belief would keep the people in readiness, if any chance of escape should ever be presented. Wearily on from year to year, and from decade to decade, those faithful priests inculcated the Hebrew religion, denounced heathenism, tried to prevent intermarriage, bound the hearts of their people with memories of the fatherland, nurtured the feeble flames of hope. Theirs was a most difficult and delicate task. They must preserve friendly relations with their Babylonian neighbors or they might bring on persecution, but they must, if possible, prevent intimate friendship; they must oblige their people to feel as strangers in a strange land, submissive but not contented.

---

### *Ceremonial Exclusiveness.*

The plan which they adopted for this most difficult work may be characterized as the device of bigoted humility. The Jews must live on good terms with their heathen neighbors, but must be effectually separated from all vital sympathy with them. This could be done only by making the Jews themselves a *peculiar* people, by obliging them to submit to certain odd and estranging ceremonies, by impressing them with the sacred belief that these oddities were divine, were the secret seal upon them as Heaven's favorites. They must be made to humiliate themselves and then to take the bigot's pride in their humiliation. They must bow to rigorous forms, and must love those forms as Jahveh's pledge of acceptance. They must be made sectarian, fanatical, exclusive. He is not much of a philosopher who fails to understand that personal humiliation, when connected with religious devotion, is an exhaustless source of bigotry. Never were such bigots, such examples of vanity, on earth, as the monks, nuns, hermits, priests, of the middle ages, who put all manner of humiliation and suffering upon themselves with the belief that their self-torture was especially pleasing to God. The Catholic Church has been eminently wise, (with that kind of wisdom,) in devising peculiar forms by which to foster at once the devotion and the

bigotry of ignorance. The Salvation Army has made a power of petty peculiarities. The name, the dress, the drill, the sanctified slang, the tambourine, the splashing through muddy streets, the falling down to prayer in a railway coach at the appointed hour, the red jackets, the flaming letters of their profession—all these take them apart, commit them, advertise them, make the world look upon them as odd—ignorance is always ready to credit oddity with sanctity—willing to feel that its own oddity is sacred. The more of a sacrifice it is to adopt these peculiarities, the more strongly the devotees are bound by them, and the more bigoted they become in parading them.

---

*The Law of Holiness.*

Chapters xvii.-xxvi. of *Leviticus* constitute what is known as the *Law of Holiness*, which was written by the priests in exile. Like *Deuteronomy*, it was ascribed to Moses. All laws were ascribed to Moses, just as all proverbs to Solomon, and all psalms, (except those of very late date,) to David. The *Law of Holiness* was written as if a code for the wandering Hebrews of the wilderness when they should enter Canaan, but of course it applied to the present situation in Babylonian exile, just as *Deuteronomy* applied to the ecclesiastical necessities of Josiah's reform. Its laws of morality were commands to abstain from those flagrant vices practiced by the Babylonians. Its repeated threatenings against the worship of heathen gods, especially Molech, were vividly practical. Its stern requirements of Sabbath observation met the religious needs of the exile in a masterly way. Its hyper-cautious regulations for the sanctity of priests gave those leaders a deeper hold on the common regard. Its demand that no sacrifice should be made, no worship conducted, except by priests, re-enforced the provisions of *Deuteronomy*. Its emphatic prohibition of the use of blood—stipulating that the blood of any creature slain for food should be poured on the ground and covered with dust—was, at least, a striking peculiarity. Its form of purification—to wash one's clothes and bathe one's body and remain alone until evening, when any ceremonial law had been broken—was another peculiarity. Its requirements that Jews should not tattoo or mark

their flesh, should not shave any part of their heads, nor trim off the corners of their beards, nor wear any garments of mixed wool and linen, were direct strokes at the fashions and fancies of Babylonia. Its provisions for a Sabbath year (the 7th) and a year of Jubilee (the 50th), were pictures of the happy time when they should return to Canaan. The final chapter (the xxvi.) was a promise of great victory and prosperity if they would be faithful. To keep all the rules and ordinances of this *Law of Holiness*, with "the affliction of their souls"—fasting and public mourning and penances—while they also dealt justly and generously by "the strangers," would make them a peculiar people, oddly dressed and barbered, with odd ceremonies; so that while the Babylonians respected them, they would remain socially distinct. The faithful would become proud of their oddities as the requirements and pledges of their god. This humility and separateness and bigotry would preserve their unity of race.

---

### *Zechariah XII.—XIV.*

must have been written very soon after the *Law of Holiness*, with which it is connected by the final verses. Of course it is put back a little, as though it were a prediction of the captivity as well as the return; but that was the common style of writing and is to be expected on all occasions. All prophets assumed to speak for God, and it was more impressive to speak forward toward an event than to relate accomplished facts. In many cases there was perhaps no intention to deceive, or give a wrong impression as to the date of authorship. The prophetic view of coming events was adopted as the more commanding style.

---

### *Ezekiel*

was a priest, taken captive as one of the hostages in 597. After five years, he tells us, he began to preach, and at the end of another twenty years, in 572, began to write. The first twenty-four chapters of his book refer to the destruction of Jerusalem—as if written before the event, though at least fourteen years after it. Chapters xxv.—xxxii. are launched against the ene-

mies of Judah, and consist of great and startling threats of vengeance. Ezekiel's threats are always startling, even if the greatness sometimes takes on the character of pomposity. He had the native genius, but not the training, for a poet. His figures are overdone and his ideas extravagant; but his heart was right. He was a patriot priest whose fire must have done more than we can easily understand in keeping the hopes of the exiles aflame. Chapters xxxiii.-xlviii. are glowing dreams of the restoration; dreams as wild as they are glowing. Nothing that even faintly resembles the facts does he foresee. His vision is an awful conflagration of war in which the Jews will be miraculously strengthened to meet and vanquish the combined nations of Asia. He sees the enemy destroyed in such immense numbers that it will take seven months to bury the dead, and the conquerors will need no other firewood for seven years than the measureless cords of spear shafts and arrows and bows they may gather from the battlefield. That is the kind of prophecy we have *before* the event: prophecy that is written after the event always tallies better with the facts. This Munchausen battle is very different from the quiet marching home of the unarmed exiles under heathen escort.

Ezekiel differs from all who went before him in his theory of providence. Prophets had promised God's help in answer to morality. Priests had pledged the divine favor in response to faithful worship. Habakkuk and Jeremiah differed greatly as to amount of scourging due the sins of God's people. Job teaches that punishment is sometimes the testing of faith and a means of establishing the good on firmer ground. Ezekiel cuts loose from all these theories and gives a new theory. God will restore the Jews to Canaan, not because they repent or cease idolatry or live righteously, but of his own free grace. The result of that unmerited kindness, or kindness distinct from and not dependent on human merit, will be the deeper repentance and purer living of God's people. This theory fore-shadows the New Testament idea that "We love him because He first loved us." It is the most fatherly thought of God yet hinted in Hebrew literature.

Ezekiel's fervid and glorious description of the new city and temple which the Jews will erect after their return from cap-

tivity is in keeping with the dream of their universal victory in war. It is so magnificently unlike what they really did that no critic will ever be tempted to deny it was a prediction. His final vision of the restoration of the twelve tribes to their tribal portions, which assumes that the absorbed "ten tribes" will be gathered from Assyria again,—that vision of things which never did and never could take place, of course rested on his prior vision of Judah's vast military operations. When you really find a prediction of specific events, it puts the theory of prophetic foresight to a melancholy test.

---

### *Lamentations.*

This book of five chapters is simply a collection of five short poems which bewail the destruction of Jerusalem and the captivity. Chapter i. concerns the deserted and ruined city, which the poet speaks of in the third person, as a widow. Then he changes the figure and makes the city bewail its own calamities, in the first person, as a deserted lover. Chapter ii. represents Mt. Zion as a father and Jerusalem as his daughter, unprotected, against whom the Lord himself hurled vengeance. Chapter iii. refers to the exiles, who are personified as the writer himself, and whom Jahveh is afflicting: "I am the man that hath seen affliction by the rod of his wrath." His sorrows are pathetically related. He pleads piteously for help, closing the song with a prayer for cursing upon his enemies; "Thy curse upon them! Persecute and destroy them in anger from under the heavens of the Lord!" Patriotic, but not Gospel-like. Chapter iv. is another wail for the sufferings of the exiles. If this be taken as a portrayal of their physical condition it is greatly exaggerated; but it is no exaggeration of the feelings of the faithful. Chapter v. is the people's prayer of penitence and plea for mercy.

The author of these poems is unknown. It was an unfounded tradition, several centuries afterwards, which attributed them to Jeremiah. They were probably written soon after the arrival of the exiles in Babylonia. The significant thing in them is the personifications in the first and third songs.

*"The Suffering Servant."*

Every new literary style is a precedent. The prophets all followed the early prophetic style of relating history as a divine voice speaking forward into the event. The style of Lamentations, following some of the eighth century psalms, was taken up again and made very powerful in the second Isaiah. That style—personification—was also occasionally adopted by the elder prophets, but only briefly, as passing figures of speech. In the second Isaiah (the last twenty-seven chapters of Isaiah,) the style becomes a prevailing and sustained method. The Jews in exile are Jahveh's suffering but faithful servants. They suffer for the sins of the whole nation, for all past iniquities. Following Lamentations the second Isaiah makes these exiles "the man that hath seen affliction," only Isaiah speaks of them in the third person instead of the first. He conceives of this afflicted servant as a sacrifice, a sin offering unto God, by which the crimes of all the national history are to be atoned for. The prophet speaks for the people who have not been carried into exile, and the exiles are this "afflicted man," "smitten of God," "wounded for our transgressions," "bruised for our iniquities," who "hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows," by whose "stripes we are healed." This man of grief (the exiles) is declared to have gone as a "lamb to the slaughter." "It pleased the Lord to bruise him and make his soul an offering for sin. God will see the travail of his soul and be satisfied." He is both the sacrifice and the priest. "He poured out his soul unto death," and "he made intercession for the transgressors."

The first Isaiah taught that all Hebrews must suffer for their sins. In the light of the fact that only a portion of the people—the prominent families—were carried into captivity, the second Isaiah concludes that these select ones are punished vicariously for the whole Hebrew race. He believes this is God's final judgment upon his chosen people; that all past sins of the race will be atoned for in this terrible affliction; that God's justice, or anger, will be satisfied; the exiles will return; Jerusalem will be re-established, and peace shall flow like a river.

The greatest literary outrage of history has been the Christian application of these words of the second Isaiah to Christ. The first seven verses of ch. lxiii. do not refer to the suffering servant. These declarations are put into the mouth of God himself. He it is who has "trodden the winepress alone," who "will trample the people in his fury," and "tread them down in anger."

---

### *Psalms.*

A few of the Psalms, such as xiv. (which is the same as liii.) xc., cxxxvii., were probably written toward the end of the captivity; but the larger portion of these poetical effusions belong to a later age. "They compose," says Kuenen, "the hymn-book of the second temple." We are strikingly confronted with the laxity of ancient criticism when the hymns of Ezra's time and later are ascribed to David. A mistake of six hundred years in the date of writing is not unusual, however, in the chronology of Biblical literature. Even that is not so bad, not so pitiable, as the modern determination that the old mistake shall stand as a test of denominational and Christian loyalty, and that the facts shall be stamped as destructive criticism.

---

### *Obadiah.*

This brief discourse, obscure, seems like a remnant of some larger work, and was probably written during the captivity. It tells of speedy deliverance, and may have been a mere letter written from the leading priest of one community of exiles to the leader of some other community, after the coming of Cyrus gave them great hopes.

---

### *History.*

The books of *Judges*, *Samuel* and *Kings* all appear to have been written during the exile. Into these works were copied the gist of the older works—*The Wars of Jahveh*, *The Acts of Solomon*, *The Chronicles of the Kings of Israel*, *The Chronicles of the Kings of Judah*.

It may be a venture to say *copied*. Those books may have been destroyed in the burning temple. These may have been written largely from memory of them; the lapses filled out by tradition. The books of that day were bulky and heavy ox-hides. It is not probable that many such were carried away by the captives.

---

### *A Shout of Triumph.*

Chapters xxxiv. and xxxv. of Isaiah, belong neither to the first nor the second Isaiah, but were composed between the taking of Babylon by Cyrus and the return of the Jews to Jerusalem. They are a mighty shout of triumph for the people who have waited and suffered, in whom the hope deferred has made the heart sick, but who now actually see the day of deliverance and are filled with joy to intoxication.

---

### *Cyrus, the Deliverer.*

Help came at last, as it so often does, from an unexpected quarter. When the Jews had been forty years in exile they began to hear of Cyrus, the young Persian rebel, who revolted against and then overthrew his own king and was fast sweeping the armies of the north before him. He might sweep down upon Babylon. There was hope in any change. Cyrus came, and there was great fighting; but the Babylonians felt secure within the mighty walls of their city. Babylon was builded on both banks of the Euphrates. The impregnable wall was arched low across the river. Nebuchadnezzar had built an artificial lake with which the volume of water in the river was regulated. When the spring floods came the river overflowed into the lake. When the dry season came the water flowed from the lake back into the river. This great feat of engineering kept the river at about the same volume all the year round. Cyrus defeated the army which Babylon sent out to meet him and drove it back into the city. Then he surrounded the city and prevented the army from coming out again. Then he sent another army to the deepening and widening of Nebuchadnezzar's reservoir. When everything was ready he turned

the whole river into it, and in the night his besieging army rushed through the river bed into the city, took the Babylonians by surprise and slaughtered them at will.

The change had come—what hope for the Jews? Suppose we had the historic warrant for saying that the Jewish priests of those agricultural colonies led their brethren over to help Cyrus—that twenty thousand Jews toiled for dear life, deepening and widening that lake, while Cyrus used his entire army in the pretended siege—that would explain why Cyrus was afterward friendly to the Jews. Have we any historic warrant for that conjecture? Professor Sayce, of Oxford, an orthodox authority, thinks we have. See his article, "Babylonia," in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*. We do know that, from the very first, Cyrus was friendly to the Jews; and we know, on general principles, that ancient conquerors were not friendly to anybody without personal and substantial reasons. If not by digging in the lake for him, then by fighting in his army, by feeding his army and caring for his sick and wounded, by acting as spies and informers for him, by giving him some great and greatly needed assistance, I think it most reasonable that they merited his gratitude. Their condition under the Babylonians was hopeless, and it is perfectly reasonable to suppose they would help anybody that could bring a change of administration. The world hasn't got over wanting changes of administration even yet. When thousands of Union soldiers were cooped up in Andersonville they would have welcomed and fought for any change, and would have plotted to assist Spaniards or Turks.

But here is another reason, of which many scholars make a great deal. The Babylonians were idolaters, worshiped the idols of many gods, and their idolatry was immoral and sensual. The Jews loathed it, for it sadly corrupted their youth. Cyrus was a Persian, and as a Persian he worshiped one God, as did the Jews. He hated idolatry as did the Jews. The Persian religion, like the Hebrew, was a devout worship of the God of righteousness. Jahveh and Ormazd were different names, but when a Jew and a Persian soldier talked of religion, when Cyrus and a Jewish priest compared notes, they must have been greatly astonished to find how closely akin were their ideas of

the one eternal and spiritual Deity. Each must have thought the other a worshiper of his own God under a different name. The religious consideration very likely had weight with Cyrus and disposed him kindly toward the Jews.

But there is another consideration greater still. Having conquered Babylon, Cyrus wanted to push on and conquer Egypt. Egypt was the eternal enemy of Persia, Assyria, Babylonia and all those northeastern kingdoms. They were always preparing for war with the empire of the Nile. Egypt was a long way off. Between him and it lay a thousand miles of wild territory, filled with savage marauders. A very small quantum of military sagacity would suggest a fortified garrison and base of supplies as far along on that road toward Egypt as possible. Cyrus would have been a fool had he not seen and embraced the opportunity which so clearly presented itself. Here were captive Jews only too anxious to go home and rebuild Jerusalem at their own expense and give him the privilege of it as a military post.

Cyrus was not a fool. He made the most of that opportunity. In less than one year from the capture of Babylon he arranged to send home all the Jews who cared to go. He gave back to them all the sacred vessels and ornaments that Nebuchadnezzar had taken from their temple. He helped them in so many ways and flattered them so shrewdly that the Jews adored him as Jahveh's own and best-beloved servant.

Any one of these three reasons—help given by Jews in the conquest of Babylon, the similarity of religions, Cyrus' need of a base of operations against Egypt—any one of the three is sufficient to account for the return of the Jews from captivity. All three together make an abundance of reasons—more than are needed. They are all natural reasons. We have no excuse for seeking or accepting any supernatural reason when things can be accounted for naturally. That Cyrus was soon afterward killed, before an Egyptian campaign could be undertaken, does not vitiate the argument.

## CHAPTER VII.

### THE HOME-COMING.

In the year 536 B.C., under a military escort supplied by Cyrus, forty or fifty thousand Jews marched home from the land of exile. Kuenen gives reasons for believing that the number was much smaller. Zerubbabel, a noted priest of the captivity, was their leader. It was a wearing journey of many weeks duration, but we can easily imagine that no hardship quelled the enthusiasm of that great home-coming. Their joy must be spiritual, however, for they did not come to a land flowing with milk and honey.

Canaan had fared badly during those fifty years of exile. Cities and properties were in ruins. The heathen tribes round about had pressed into the land and gained a footing and lived on equal terms with the Jews who had not been taken captive. The returning exiles found a mongrel population, especially in the rural districts, and they all settled near Jerusalem. Their first ambition was to re-build the city and the temple of their fathers. So poor and weak were they, and so troubrous were the times, that the second temple, though a small and modest affair, was not completed until 516—twenty years after the return.

---

#### *Literature of the Return.*

*Chapters xxiv.-xxvii.* of *Isaiah* are a separate production, written while the Jews were struggling to build their temple. The picture of desolation in ch. xxiv. is in melancholy contrast with the brilliant hopes of chapters xxxiv.-xxxv., written fifteen or eighteen years before in Babylon. These two short books may or may not be the work of the same author. If they are, his feelings have greatly changed during these first years of the return. Shouts of triumph have become bitter complaints, and even his hopes have a savage kind of determination in

them. When the temple is completed, God will take awful vengeance on the rascals roundabout who have dealt treacherously—(verses 16-23.) In ch. xxv. the writer gets comfort out of the fact that a city, (we know not what city,) of some enemy has been despoiled. Vrs. 9 voices a grim and desperate trust—a patient and hard-hearted waiting for the god of vengeance. Ch. xxvi. looks to the completion of the temple as a sort of resurrection. They have been as dead men, but they shall live. Ch. xxvii. is a continued wail, with sturdy hope for blessing “in that day” when God shall be properly worshiped in “the holy mount at Jerusalem.”

*Chapters i.-viii. of Zechariah*, written in the year 520, are modeled after the turgid pattern of Ezekiel. They also have Ezekiel's earnestness and fervor. After picturing the general despair, (ch. i.) an angel comes to exhort the building of the temple, or its hasty completion. Ch. ii. produces another angel to declare that Jerusalem shall be so great and so divinely protected that no walls will be needed. Ch. iii. has an angel to exhort Joshua, the High Priest. Then Zechariah adopts the style of Second Isaiah and personates the returned exiles, the suffering servant, as a branch or shoot that springs from the stump of a decayed tree. This “man,” who is called “branch,” has been the occasion of endless nonsense at the hands of theologians. Ch. iv. has an angel to exhort Zerubbabel, who laid the foundations, and who shall complete the temple. But Zechariah begins to doubt that it will ever be done without miracles—“not by might nor by power, but by the spirit of the Lord.” Ch. v. represents a flying roll, inscribed with curses, and the idea seems to be that henceforth the nation shall not be cursed for the sins of individuals, but that wicked individuals shall bear their own curse. The past sins of the nation, personified as an outcast woman, are driven to Babylonia. Ch. vi. contains a vision of horses and chariots of judgment, and a further pledge, by an angel, that the temple shall be completed. Chs. vii. and viii. appeal to the moral sense, and picture the prosperity and happiness that will yet come to the long-waiting remnant of God's people.

*Haggai*, who also wrote in the year 520, dedicates his words to Governor Zerubbabel and High Priest Joshua. Though

himself a Jewish priest, Zerubbabel is the eastern monarch's representative. Perhaps he had little else to do than gather the tribute. The High Priest was the actual ruler of the Jews. Haggai pictures the poverty and hunger of his comrades in striking phraseology, but promises that if they will hastily complete the temple, these forms of wretchedness will vanish and God will abundantly bless them.

*Joel* took advantage of a plague of locusts to point the divine vengeance. All the losses and calamities of the time are due to the fact that "the meat-offering and drink-offering" are delayed. Let the temple be hastily completed and the service properly established, then "The Lord will roar out of Zion," the heathen will be discomfited, the earth will yield bountifully, and the Jews will be happy.

---

### *The Sufferer's Pride.*

The remnants of the Ten Tribes, which were not taken captive by the Assyrians, had lingered on in Samaria these two hundred years, but they had mixed with heathen peoples until the returning exiles would not recognize them as of Hebrew blood. In the Puritanical eyes of the exile-Jew, these mixed Israelites had ceased to be the children of Abraham, and were become despised "Samaritans." These Samaritans, while overwhelmed with foreign admixture, had done what the Saxons of England did with the invading Normans—had retained and even imposed upon the foreigners their own language and religion. They felt that they had made Israelites of the strangers who came amongst them and intermarried with them, and they were proud of the accomplishment. The returned exiles did not appreciate that accomplishment. They despised the Samaritans for having mixed at all with foreigners. They despised the Samaritans especially for not having suffered as they themselves had suffered. The Samaritans were ready to welcome the exiles home and assist them in building their temple. They were anxious that all who had any Hebrew blood in their veins should re-unite in one kingdom as in the glorious days of Solomon, but the sufferers were proud of their own heroic experiences and they scorned the stay-at-home

Samaritans as the battle-scarred veteran despises the stay-at-home at the close of the war. Samaritan help was loftily repelled. The exiles from Babylonia would be self-sufficient exiles in Jerusalem, nurturing their pride even in their poverty, for they believed God would yet restore their little band to supreme power. They had been the great sufferers, and they would have the glory all their own. Egotism and selfishness are not seldom the fruits of faithful endurance.

This unfraternal spirit of "the faithful" angered the Samaritans, who then became and forever remained the hated and hating enemies of the Jews. For the next five centuries these two peoples, both claiming Abraham to be their father, kept alive all the bitterness and spitefulness and littleness of a family quarrel.

## CHAPTER VIII.

### THE LAW.

#### *Babylonian Jews.*

Not all, not half, the exiles took advantage of Cyrus' courtesy to return to Canaan. Under Persian rule Babylon was a comfortable home for Jews. Cyrus and his successors gave them perfect liberty of citizenship and religion. The Persian religion was so nearly like their own that there was little about it to offend their prejudices. Thousands of them had made money and married Babylonian wives and built their houses, where children were born to them. They were comfortable and happy and had lost much of their sectarian zeal. Why should they go back to Judea? Judea had been so utterly desolated that to live there was to live in the poverty and struggle of the frontier. As word came of the sufferings and discouragements in Jerusalem, the Babylonian Jews were less and less inclined to make martyrs of themselves.

Jews of wealth and culture especially liked the city of Babylon. It was old and rich and luxurious. It required a vast amount of enthusiasm to give up that splendid way of living and suffer the hardships of Judea for the mere sake of the temple worship. They could preserve the Israelite faith where they were. Why should they go back to poverty and hardship for the mere sake of the temple? That is the way they began to put the case. That is why, after the first rush of zeal, so few of the Jews abandoned their Babylonian homes.

Jews have always had the faculty of gaining prominence in Gentile capitals. Disraeli became premier of England. Rothchild dictated the finances of Paris and France. Josephus became the favorite of a Roman emperor. The Jews in Babylon struggled up until we find Ezra in prime favor at the heathen court, and Nehemiah is actually the king's cup-bearer. Such

position of influence had the descendants of the exiles obtained in seventy or eighty years after the return.

Among the Jews of Babylon, those who gained highest favor with the heathen rulers were the ones who maintained their pure Jewish blood and faith. These select and exclusive families took vast pride in their faithfulness to race and religion. Of course they were better educated, more highly cultured, shrewder politicians, than their brethren at Jerusalem. Eighty years of freedom in the great capital of the Euphrates had not been lost upon them, but their ambition was still for Jerusalem. Though they made money and enjoyed life in Babylon, they ceaselessly dreamed of joining the friends in Canaan, and of making their forefathers' religion the glorious thing so long prophesied. If they did not go to the land of their fathers and endure its privations, they did what was of infinitely greater moment to the future of Judaism—they created the ritual and established the ceremonies which alone could insure the very existence of the religion they loved. The intellectual work is always the greatest and most enduring work of any people. The Jewish priests in Babylon, during those seventy-eight years between the return (536) and Ezra's move to Jerusalem (458), did the intellectual work which gave Judaism five more centuries of organized life.

---

### *The Priesthood and the Mythical Tabernacle.*

In Exodus and Leviticus and Numbers we read of a costly and most gorgeous tabernacle, a movable temple, magnificently furnished and appointed for ceremonial worship. In connection with that tabernacle, we read of a fully developed priesthood, with a completed torah, whose laws and ordinances were elaborate and minute almost beyond patience. That tabernacle and that priesthood never had any existence until they were created in the imagination of the exile priests. They also were pious frauds, wrought out with patriotic purpose, as was the book of Deuteronomy.

In using this expression—pious fraud—let me be understood as putting the emphasis on the former, not on the latter word. This crediting of earlier authors with their own works was

fraudulent, but it was a fraud from which personal pride and self-interest were quite eliminated. Indeed there was a remarkable self-forgetfulness in this obliteration of their own honors. It was a fraud for the sake of the cause they loved better than self. It was "doing a little harm that great good might come of it." That is always a doubtful and dangerous proceeding, but the wrong of it was not then appreciated. Could the bad results have been foreseen, they were enough to appal even the stout hearts of Josiah and Ezra. The hatred and persecution, the denunciation of students and investigation, the popular suspicion of simple truth and historic fact, the wide fear that intellectual light is destructive of religion, all which are still produced by the false theories which rest on these pious frauds, are enough to point the injunction that it is never wise to do wrong that good may come of it. All this was future and unseen to Josiah and Ezra, and we must acquit them of much evil purpose.

Of course it has occurred to the most purblind reader of the Bible to wonder what became of that famous tabernacle and that closely organized priesthood of the Wilderness. There was the movable temple, the place of God's presence, where the divine glory was daily manifested, where was conducted one of the most elaborate services the world ever saw, all through the journeying of those forty years, and right up to the ford of the Jordan: beyond the crossing of Jordan we never again hear tell of it. There was the full-fledged priesthood, with High Priest and assistants, with mitre and stole, with every conceivable pomp and circumstance, in a constant blaze of activity and renown, right up to the Jordan ford: beyond the crossing of Jordan that priesthood is never seen nor heard tell of. Before Jordan, the glorious brazen altar, the laver of superb construction, the sacred vessels of fine workmanship, and all the solemn formalities of preparing the sacrifice: after Jordan, a rude heap of stones, with the simplest barbarian manner of worship. Before Jordan, a magnificence of ceremonial which would do credit to Saint Peter's: after Jordan, a primitive sacrifice by any common chieftain or head of a family in the forest or on the hill-top. Before Jordan, a thoroughly civilized and cultured and beautiful procedure:

after Jordan, the savagery of human sacrifice. What so suddenly became of that fine religious culture, that noble and loftily intellectual and heart-inspiring liturgy? Was it all washed down into the Dead Sea?

Of all the miracles recorded in the Old Testament, none is half so wonderful as would have been required to account for this instantaneous extinction of the tabernacle and the priesthood and all Hebrew memory of them. We might as well claim that in the early years of the 17th century the Indians of New England had a religious ceremonial, as ornate as the Catholic ceremonial of Italy, which they had forgotten and lost all traces of when the Pilgrims landed a few years later. Everything that pertains to the tabernacle of Moses and the priesthood of Aaron is fictitious. No Hebrew or Israelite or Jew ever heard of these things until he heard them from the priests of the exile.

The priesthood of the Hebrews began with the building of Solomon's temple. Its first great prominence came with Josiah's introduction of Deuteronomy in the year 621. When Josiah was struggling to lift the priesthood into power why did he not refer to that ancient priesthood of Aaron? Why did he not read to the assembled nation the laws and ordinances of the tabernacle? Because he had never heard tell of them. When the book of Deuteronomy was put forth with the great purpose of ecclesiasticising the nation, why was Aaron's name omitted? Why was no reference made in that book to the tabernacle? Because Hilkiah, the High Priest, and Shaphan, the Chief Scribe, knew nothing about Aaron and the tabernacle. The authors of this forged book of Deuteronomy constantly speak of "The place which God shall choose" to be worshiped in. Why do they not speak plainly of the tabernacle as the place which God had long before chosen, and sanctified a thousand times over? Because they never heard tell of and did not imagine any such thing as the tabernacle. In Deut. xxxi. 14-15, the King James version speaks of a tabernacle; but it is a mistranslation, as the Revised Version shows. It was simply the "tent of meeting"—the tent in which the elders gathered for consultation.

When the priests of the exile wrote the *Law of Holiness* that

"tent of meeting" had been given a slight semblance of ecclesiasticism. There had been a small evolution of assumption concerning Mosaic ritualism. The name of Aaron had been rescued from oblivion and made priestly. The *Law of Holiness* yet calls it the "tent of meeting," but makes it the place of sacrifice; still there is no elaborateness of ceremonial. The *Law of Holiness* was probably composed in the early part of the exile—before the year 575 B.C.

After the return under Zerubbabel, 536; after the completion of the second temple, 516; after the Babylonian Jews came into social prominence—perhaps later than 475 B.C.—the Jewish priests of the Babylonian colony began their great work of making an ecclesiastical history. Back of the conquest of Canaan there was nothing except the traditions and hero stories of the *Prophet history*, which was written three hundred years before their own time. They re-wrote the full period from Adam to the death of Joshua. They wrote from the priestly standpoint. Their entire work was for the sake of the tabernacle. They took the proportions of Solomon's temple and scaled them to the tent. They made the tent, in every measure, exactly half of the temple. Josiah had wonderful success in attributing Deuteronomy to Moses. The priests of the exile had been extensively successful in attributing the *Law of Holiness* to Moses. Proverbs had been freely and successfully attributed to Solomon; psalms to David; while Job had been accepted as a real historic person, and the Samson myth had come to be a genuine hero; what was there to hinder a more gigantic feat of pious imposition than any of these? It was a hundred and twenty or thirty years now since the temple of Solomon was burned. The uneducated masses could easily be induced to believe that the history now being concocted had rested for centuries in that ancient temple—discovered in the ruins, as they believed Deuteronomy had been. There was no "destructive criticism," then. Credulity had full sway.

The entire purpose was to create an imaginary government of the priesthood, with the tabernacle instead of the temple, in that ancient and unhistoric time—a ritualism, a theocracy, which would suit their own times—a form of ecclesiastical organization, religious and political, in which the High Priest

was supreme ruler, the priesthood a complete government. They must so arrange their history that no king was needed. Moses was made to be a guide and an inspired prophet, himself more than half priest. Aaron was exalted as the sublime type of earthly rule. God himself was made the actual ruler, with Aaron for his spokesman and representative. The High Priest was clothed with Divine wisdom and authority. It was a great scheme, carefully wrought out. Ezra was perhaps the chief author. His famous *Priestcode*, containing all that part of the *Hexateuch* which, as we have already seen, does not belong to the *Prophet history*, was completed in Babylon, about the year 458 B.C.

---

### *Ezra in Jerusalem.*

As soon as the *Priestcode* was completed, in the year 458, Ezra and many others of like patriotism and fanaticism set out from Babylon to reform the affairs of their brethren in Judea. They brought rich presents and good wishes and infinite zeal. They found the religion of their fatherland in a sad state. The temple, less than sixty years old, was neglected and falling into ruin. Their brethren had suffered in poverty, waiting Jahveh's blessing, until their faith was exhausted, and they had gone to work to make friends of Mammon. They had established business relations with the heathen roundabout, and were giving more heed to their flocks and vineyards than to the offices of worship.

The sin of the Ten Tribes had become the sin of the returned exiles and their descendants—intermarriage with the heathen. This intermarriage more than everything else was breaking down the sectarianism, the social and religious peculiarity, of the Jews. Such families were not so exclusively under control of the priests as other families were. Students of sociology have often pointed out the fact that it is the wealthier and the more intelligent and cultured of different nations who intermarry. They are the people who can travel and who are more attracted by personal qualities, who give less heed to traditions, who do not marry somebody in the neighborhood as a matter of course, who are more independent of priestly regulations. In

conformity with that general law it was the better class of Jewish men and women who had foreign wives and husbands. It was the houses of special prosperity and refinement throughout Judea in which father or mother was heathen, and to which heathen grooms and brides came for the children. Such intermarriage is a good thing for the coming race. It is God's great law of physical and mental and moral evolution, but it is not always a good thing for the perpetuity of a distinct order of politics or theology. It broadens the area of life and blots out the lines of tradition. It make humanitarians, not sectarians. It was fast merging heathen and Jew into a new and better and less fanatical race. To Ezra and his fellow fanatics who were honestly sectarian, and who had lofty aspirations for a nation of the pure faith and blood, the case looked desperate. Having kept their own purity of race and faith in a heathen land, this unfaithfulness in the fatherland was peculiarly shocking. A marvelous energy and the cruelty of despair were aroused in Ezra's heart. There is no cruelty on earth like that of a religious fanatic. He felt that the old-time superstition could be appealed to. How slowly superstition dies! It slumbers; but to what awful vengeance it can be awakened! With what multiplied power cultured superstition can wield ignorant superstition! Ezra's education and his honesty made his own superstition invincible. In the most dramatic way he excited the masses of ignorant and poor people to the pitch of madness with this single question: "Why, in these eighty years since the return, have you enjoyed so little prosperity and suffered so much poverty and defeat? Your fathers came back from Babylon with high hopes. God was ready to bless them and make a mighty nation of them. He did not. There is a reason why. You know well enough what that reason is. Your fathers and you have toiled on in misery. It is because you have allowed in your midst the horrible sin of the Samaritans. Put away that evil from amongst you; then God will bless you. Until then He will pursue you with vengeance."

What was the evil to be put away? The heathen wives and husbands and children. For two or three generations those domestic bonds had been forming. The guillotine of fanat-

icism was to cut right down through the family ties and sacred affections of many thousand homes. Every wife or husband of heathen blood should immediately leave the country. When Ezra announced that decree there went up to heaven such a wail of grief as Nebuchadnezzar's captivity itself had not caused. But Ezra had the fanaticism of the masses up to the pitch where it gave melancholy support to his decree. Thousands of homes were immediately ruined, the friendship with all un-Jewish people was broken, the fanatical priest came into supreme power, the Puritanical age of Judea was begun.

---

### *Nehemiah in Jerusalem.*

Ezra's power seems to have exhausted itself with the expulsion of the heathen wives and husbands. He did not feel equal to the task of introducing his *Priestcode*, his so-called *Law of Moses*. He kept it secret and bided his time. The time delayed. Fresh calamities hurried upon Jerusalem. Again the temple was almost totally destroyed. The city walls were broken down. Judea became the helpless prey of those heathen peoples roundabout who had been so deeply insulted by the action of Ezra. Thirteen weary years dragged their slow lengths along, and Ezra had pushed his Puritanism but had done little else.

Over in Babylon the cup-bearer to Artaxerxes, the Jewish Nehemiah, was moved by the sad stories from Jerusalem to ask a great favor of his royal patron. The favor was that Artaxerxes would appoint him Governor of Judea, for Judea was still a Persian province. His prayer was granted, and the new Governor, in the year 445, came to Jerusalem with royal authority. Nehemiah was quite as much of a fanatic and much more of a manager than Ezra. He was a very whirlwind of enthusiasm and activity. In a few months he had rebuilt the walls of the city and taught the heathen some wholesome military lessons. He corrected abuses, even going so far as to cancel the debts of all the poor, which gained him the love of the common people. He repaired, practically rebuilt, the temple, and established the worship quite gloriously.

The great thing he did, however, was the thing Ezra had been unable to do—he promulgated the *Priestcode*. After the example of Josiah he assembled the people and had the so-called *Law of Moses* read and explained to them; and great was their astonishment at hearing of the tabernacle and all its magnificent forms of worship; and their wonder knew no bounds at the recital of priestly power and honor in the olden time.

Nehemiah had not been kind to the poor, however, without the purpose of exacting implicit obedience. The priestly rule was rigidly enforced. All the tithes and sacrifices and ceremonial laws were put into strict operation. The prohibition of intermarriage with heathen was binding to the letter. The Sabbath became a day of awful solemnity. There was order, economy, rigidity and terrible earnestness throughout the land which this old-time Cromwell dominated. The people became obedient, worshipful, strong of spirit. The sense of weakness was gone. Enthusiasm came. Judea entered upon an age of prosperity.

The saying is attributed to Napoleon that "Goodness or badness in rulers is scarcely to be considered: national prosperity demands first of all that rulers be men of personal power." Ezra and Nehemiah were men of power. They were fanatics, but they were immeasurably more than that; they were statesmen, and they were men of supreme virtues, though cruel and deceptive. Their cruelty was necessity and their deception was policy. They stood once more in the breach and stayed the national collapse. They organized and drilled and inspired until the Jews rose from utter discouragement and negligence into a compact, energetic, keenly intelligent and proudly sectarian people.

If the reader is confused by these alternate commendations and rebukes, these commendations for wisdom and these rebukes for cruelty, these commendations for honesty of purpose and these rebukes for the use of questionable methods, he will perhaps find no relief except in the general course of human history. He will find that nearly all great epochs are accompanied with local injustice and tainted by acts of violence.

It has been a grand thing for the world that the Hebrews

became supreme in Canaan, but that does annul their murder and robbery of the Canaanites. It has been a great thing for the world that the Cæsars destroyed hundreds of tribes and petty kingdoms in the establishment of Rome, but that does not sanctify the unnumbered ravages of the imperial army nor the wholesale confiscations of property. It has been a grand thing for civilization that England obtained sway in India, but that does not blot out the cruelties of Warren Hastings' rule.

Those who are too bitter against the wrongs committed by tyrants and the robberies of men in power, are apt to forget the ignorance and barbarity with which advancing forces are met. On the other hand, those who too readily condone the harshness of progressive methods are apt to forget that history might have worked itself out on other lines, that the heights of civilization might have been reached sooner with more humane procedures. But for certain great injustices Israel or Rome or England might not have been the leading nation, but there would have been leaders, teachers, progress, arts, science, literature, religion, all that we have, and better, if men had always been better and nations more just. It is an unspeakable fallacy to suppose that the historic course of human life was the only possible course. Liberty and culture and righteousness might have been wrought out as well and as speedily had every great nation of the past been blotted from the earth before its day of power and every great man of the past died in his infancy. Other nations, other men, other forms of government and religion, other methods of progress would have arisen to do the work. God's eternal purpose could not be blocked by any human failure. The glory of providence is that, whatever methods men adopt, the Divine purpose moves on—if not by a straight path, then by a zigzag or roundabout path, but forever on to its goal. If men do right, the right steadily develops; if they do wrong, there is a right in things which overrules the wrong and makes it a servant. Water may be confined but not compressed. As the secret fountains feed the reservoir a time comes when no possible barrier may withstand the cumulative force. Tyranny may hedge about the thoughts and the loves and the liberties and the noble aspirations of men, but man always receives a

fresh supply from the divine fountains—the breaking of all bonds and the wide rush of progress will come. A river may be turned from its direct course a hundred times, but it will circle or plough through all barriers and find the sea. The evils of human policy have made the stream of life a crooked one. Otherwise it might have been straighter and arrived at the goal of civilization more quickly.

---

### *The Pentateuch.*

Very soon after Nehemiah's arrival in Jerusalem (445), the *Priestcode* of Ezra and the *Prophet history* of the eighth century were combined, dove-tailed, made into one, as we have already seen, and substantially as we have it to-day. *Deuteronomy* was put into it as the fifth book, *Jacob's Blessing*, *The Covenant* and the *Law of Holiness* were all fitted in, and the whole great work ascribed bodily to Moses. This was the beginning of that work of the temple Scribes, who proceeded to gather about the *law* those commentaries long afterward known as "the traditions of the elders." The forming of the Pentateuch from these various writings was probably under the direction of Ezra and Nehemiah. The first half of Joshua, written in the eighth century, was also welded to the second half, written in this fifth century.

---

### *Memoirs and Malachi.*

The books of *Ezra* and *Nehemiah* were put into their present shape more than a hundred years after the time we are considering. The memoirs contained in those books, however, were probably written, substantially as we have them, by the men themselves. In both books, part of the writing is in the first person and part in the third person. The general substance of those parts which are written in the first person belongs to Ezra and Nehemiah. The rest, and the editing of these memoirs themselves, must be set down as the work of some unknown author and editor of the third century.

*Malachi* means messenger. This book, in the form of a prediction, was probably written a few years after the coming

of Nehemiah to Jerusalem, whose brilliant work it commemo-  
rates. Nehemiah is the "Messenger" who came "suddenly"  
to the temple; he is the "sun of righteousness" who arose  
"with healing in his wings;" it was he who "turned the heart  
of the fathers to the children and the heart of the children to  
the fathers," by canceling the debts of the poor.

---

### *Ruth and Jonah.*

Ezra and Nehemiah had insisted that Jews should marry  
none but Jews, and they had diligently taught that Jews alone  
were God's children, that all other peoples were outside the  
pale of Divine providence and regard. Against this exclusive  
law of marriage and against this idea of God's exclusive regard  
for Jews the two novels, or stories, of *Ruth* and *Jonah* were  
respectively launched—not far from the year 400 B. C.

The plot of the book of *Ruth* is laid away back in the time  
of the Judges. It is a simple, charming pastoral of how a  
Hebrew and his wife journeyed into a heathen land, and how  
their two sons married heathen girls, and how happy they all  
were; and then how the father and both sons died, and how a  
sweet and lasting love united the widowed mother and her  
heathen daughters-in-law, and how one of the younger women  
clung to the mother and went back with her to the Hebrew  
country. A sweeter story was never told. We can easily im-  
agine how it appealed to the hearts of thousands whose parents  
or grandparents had thus been a happy union of Jew and Gen-  
tile. How eagerly they would read it and look back to "the  
good old times," and thank God there was no Ezra then to  
crush the ties of family affection and drive good people from  
their homes because they had married those they loved.

The last part of the story, Ruth's marriage with Boaz, though  
delightfully told, is the least pleasing part of it. The author  
must needs end the story that way, however, for he was writing  
with a determined purpose. He meant to give an illustrious  
example that should be a weapon of defense against the exclu-  
siveness of the priesthood for all time. He had a splendid  
reason for marrying Ruth to Boaz. It was that he might make  
a heathen woman to be the great-grandmother of King David.

Nobody knew enough about that ancient history to contradict him, and he had written a story so simple, so beautiful, that everybody would repeat it and love it—a story that could never die—a story that put heathen blood into the veins of the most illustrious man of the nation's history.

The book of *Jonah* is not only a novel, it is one of the finest bits of irony that ever was written. The author's purpose is not only to deny but to ridicule the idea that God cares for nobody but Jews. As Hebrew writers continually do, this author goes back several centuries for his precedent. He takes a prophet, of whom there was a dim tradition, of the time of Jeroboam the Second, in the ninth century, and he gives to that prophet the exclusive and narrow-souled principles of Nehemiah. *Jonah*, just like Nehemiah, will not have it that Divine providence and regard are for any but Jews. If ever a man was made ridiculous, *Jonah* is held up to ridicule in his stubborn devotion to that narrow view of providence. The author takes a poet's license in representing God as playing alternately upon the bigotries and fears of the unwilling missionary. At first the Almighty accedes to *Jonah*'s universal hatred of everybody but Jews—grants *Jonah* the happy privilege of condemning the greatest of heathen cities to destruction. *Jonah* is afraid that God's wrath will not hold out, has a suspicion that he is being ridiculed, and he tries to run away. By a series of miracles, which the keen-witted author meant to be as ridiculous as possible, *Jonah* is brought back and compelled to go and pronounce judgment on the heathen city. Then God mocks him by not fulfilling the judgment. *Jonah* goes out into the wilderness, angry and humiliated. More miracles, and quite as ridiculous, are worked to show him what a stupid he has been; and then comes the great proclamation that God is not a monster who would destroy children and ignorant people because they were heathen. The roars of laughter which greeted the publication of that story of *Jonah* must have gone far toward shaking the foundations, in all the more thoughtful minds, of Nehemiah's exclusive Jewish providence! But when the laughter had evaporated there was found a strong draught of common sense and reason and reverence in this cup of wisdom. God was not simply

the God of the Jews; He was the God of righteousness, the protector of the helpless, the Father of the penitent, throughout all the earth. Peter, like Jonah, was an unwilling missionary to the heathen, and after Peter had been treated a good deal as Jonah was, his narrow mind is opened until he can see that "God is no respecter of persons, but in every nation," (not he that believeth in the creed, but) "he that worketh righteousness is accepted."

---

### *The Conservative Era.*

The intense religion of the priestly order lasted about two centuries after the coming of Ezra to Jerusalem. During the early part of this period, as we have seen, the ceremonial *law* was published and incorporated with the ancient history of the Hebrews. People gradually came to believe that all the past had been like the present. They thought of Moses as a modern ritualist, of David as a writer of hymns for the temple, of the priesthood and the formalism as belonging to all the earlier ages. All that is about like the notions of children in this age who should think that St. Paul traveled on the steam cars and bought morning papers and preached in churches that were lighted by gas or electricity. It is so easy to believe that our age has always been. The next generation after Ezra regarded the *Priestcode*, the *law*, the elaborate and intricate ritualism of Exodus, Leviticus and Numbers, as the possession of the Hebrews in the Wilderness and of all succeeding times.

For almost two centuries after Ezra's reform (458 B.C.) the religious ideas and ceremonies of the Jews were settled and fixed, habits were continuous, the masses were believers in the common teaching, it scarcely occurred to people that things ever had been or ever could be different; Judaism was firm, ingraft, changeless, like Catholicism in the Middle Ages or Scotch Presbyterianism of the 17th century. There were a few noble heretics, like the authors of *Ruth* and *Jonah*, in the early part of this period, but their heresies were overcome, their books were read with a different meaning, just as Longfellow and Whittier have been read by millions who did not see the

un-Orthodox teaching of their poems. These two centuries belonged to the priests. All thought and feeling was directed by the priests. Priests traveled constantly throughout the land teaching the ceremonial law and binding it upon the hearts of the people as the word of God, given to Moses. The old strain of the prophets, the pleading of morality as God's great requirement, had died away. It was not righteousness, not people, that God loved; it was the temple, the sacrifice, the minutest requirement of the ceremonial law. All other thoughts of providence were lost in this—that God was pleased with the temple service—that the exact, complete forms of worship were supremely delightful to him—that for the joy He took in being perfectly worshiped He would render all assistance and bestow all blessing. It was an age in which people did not think, an age in which thought was considered dangerous, an age of faith, of reverence, of humility, of brave defence, of the love of ecclesiastical duty, of bigotry, of conserving energy, of plodding sameness, of narrowing impulse, of intense patriotism and sectarianism, of exaggerated peculiarities, of orderly and obedient conduct, of growing fanaticism, of unmeasured credulity, of slavish obedience to the priesthood, of united devotion and dwindling intelligence. Like all other epochs of Conservatism, it was an age that utilized the forces of the past, consumed its own energies in maintaining its own social and religious order, and provided nothing for the future. Conservatism is a winter in which men warm and feed themselves by means of the toil and harvest of the previous summer—arriving always at that breaking up of the springtime in which Radicalism must launch forth to provide a new harvest.

---

*Chronicles.*

*Chronicles*, written as late as 300 B. C., was intended to fix the ecclesiastical régime, of the decadence of which there were ominous signs too clearly visible to the wise. *Chronicles* deals with the temple of Solomon, as the *Priestcode* dealt with the tabernacle of Moses. The tabernacle was entirely fictitious, but the author of *Chronicles* succeeded in putting a round sum

of fiction into the first temple. Everything concerning that first temple should be a glorious model, an ideal, for the devotees of his own age. He cannot make his precedents too startling. He exalts David into a very wonder of devotion, and gathers ideal princes into his plan, and sets forth the old time ceremonials with lavish disregard of history and possibility. He tells us that David gave three thousand talents of gold and seven thousand talents of silver, that the "princes" gave five thousand talents of gold and ten thousand talents of silver, with which to complete the temple. The *Bible Atlas and Gazetteer*, published by the *American Tract Society*, gives the value of a gold talent as something over \$24,000. Eight thousand talents would be \$192,000,000. A talent of silver was something more than \$1,000. Seventeen thousand talents would be \$17,000,000. A grand total, including the "ten thousand drams of gold and the eighteen thousand talents of brass," of more than \$200,000,000. That is preparation for a great house. Then we are told that when Solomon got ready to build the temple, he detailed 150,000 men to do the work, with 3,600 overseers. This immense army of workmen toiled seven years in the construction of the temple. What a gigantic house it ought to have been! What an astonishment it is to read that the wondrous structure was only 60 x 120 feet! How could 150,000 men work seven years, at an expense of more than \$200,000,000, in erecting a little house, 60 x 120 feet? The Chronicler did not dare make the size of Solomon's temple different from the traditional memory of it; he could only exaggerate the expense; but he counted on infinite credulity to fit his two sets of figures together.

With equal assurance, the Chronicler tells us that at the dedication 22,000 oxen and 120,000 sheep were offered in sacrifice. 144,000 animals slaughtered in one week! Something over 20,500 a day! Mr. Armour's greatest slaughter house in the world is considered a wonder by its killing of 10,000 a day. Solomon is made to more than double Armour, and all of this in the little temple court which contained less than an acre of space. Whatever else the Chronicler was, he was certainly a poet, "of imagination all compact." The cloud of God's presence that filled the temple, and the king's great prayer of dedi-

cation, and the throngs of drilled priests in attendance, may all be measured by these wild statements of expense and sacrifice. When history is written by a priest, in the interest of a ruling priesthood, at a time when there is no critic to dissect his statements, we may always expect this kind of history.

Chronicles did what it was intended to do—it fixed the idea in the minds of the ignorant masses that the priesthood of the second temple was but a feeble copy of the priesthood of the first temple—that the order of life and religion in these 3d and 4th centuries rested on the glorious precedent of the 10th and 11th centuries. A fable universally believed has all the political power of truth. This particular fable stayed the disruption a little while.

---

### *Psalms.*

The psalms, half of which are expressly attributed to David, and many others to David's time, belong also, in the bulk, to this period of Chronicle writing. They compose the service book of the second temple. It is more than doubtful if a single one of them can be attributed to the time of David or Solomon. Their great purpose is, exactly as in Chronicles, to glorify the temple worship. The *law*, which they constantly magnify, is the *Priestcode*. Their spirit of devotion is sublime. Priestly religions are always noted for a devout trust and exalted faith in the personal relations of God to his church, his altar, and to the true hearts of his elect worshipers. The psalms are flooded and illumined with noble conceptions of the Divine presence as a guiding, helping, pitying, comforting presence. Confession, penitence, heroic resolve, confidence, moral courage, spiritual communion, joy of the new spiritual births, exaltation of soul, gratitude, reverence, awe, secret and sacred power with God, all the deep and high emotions of religion are so finely expressed in these ancient prayers and songs of the heart that they must forever remain as the best expressions of devout sentiment.

This true sentiment is all turned by the psalm writers into priestly channels. This natural feeling is made to serve the temple and the ceremonial. Even a great old nature-hymn, like the first six verses of Psalm xix., is adapted, appended to, and made to place God's revelation in the universe as inferior

to his revelation in the *Priestcode*. Psm. lxxxiv. is a declaration of God's presence in the temple, so beautifully worded that the charm of it obscures its bad theology, (as if God were nowhere else,) and so manifestly the loving conviction of its author that we forgive all narrowness of his thought in sympathy with his fine and tender emotions. Even the psalm of human brotherhood, (the cxxxiii.,) must be brought under subjection to this priestly régime by a reference to Aaron and the anointing oil, and a declaration that in Mt. Zion is the fountain of divine life. Even the psalm of filial love, (the xxiii.,) is made to express life's highest joy as the work of a temple priest—and it is spoiled by an expression of favoritism which grates harshly as if the priest's enemies were always God's enemies, whom God will take pleasure in taunting with luxurious attentions to his priests. The shameful venom and horrible cursing of psalm cxix. carries the thought of favoritism to the most immoral extreme, as if no crime could be a crime in one who worshiped according to the temple code.

The belief in Divine favoritism always yields an extreme influence. It makes a pure heart most reverent and devoted. It makes a cruel nature quite diabolical. Whoever believes that he belongs to God's favorite class treads the precipice of fanaticism. Fanaticism may continue to be a depth of love. On any occasion it may change to a gulf of hate. Face your martyr about and he easily becomes a persecutor. Whoever is ready to die for his peculiar belief may quickly get ready to kill for it. In the unambitious, a belief in favoritism takes the form of placid obedience and affectionate trust; but even with them, when the theological question comes up, there is likely to be a gentle and mournful kind of suspicion toward all who do not accept the creed. In the ambitious, it takes the form of creed-defence or persecution. On the one hand a humble and tearful selfishness; on the other hand a robust and aggressive vengeance. Even that very mild form of favoritism which claims a special and peculiar inspiration for the Bible, as *their* authority, has always characterized the Bible-defenders as an assuming and vindictive race.

It thus happens that the psalms contain not only the most tender and beautiful but the hardest and most repulsive senti-

ments. This belief in favoritism accounts for both. Fenelon and Torquemada are alike the natural products of Catholicism. Wesley's prayers and Calvin's murder of Servetus are alike the natural products of belief in God's exclusive love of Protestantism. The most self-sacrificing missionary and most bigoted heresy-hunter grow from the same stalk. Extravagant belief in God's peculiar concern for *us* and for our creed and our Church is thrice loving for our loving moods, is gall and bitterness when our mood is crossed. The sense of universal providence may not sharpen to a point of such enthusiasm; neither does it sharpen to a dagger's point, in act or word or feeling.

Let it be repeated, however, that the spiritual mood of the psalms is man's highest religious mood. We all, at times, have the great uplift of a feeling of personal relation with God. We need not believe in favoritism to be touched and profoundly moved by the sense of personal relationship—unless we rise to that highest and grandest of all religious thinking wherein every man is the favorite of Heaven, wherein the universal providence is seen to be an infinite care for each. Indeed, the true evolution of religion is not to detract from God's care for any, but to appreciate the fullness of his concern for all; to understand that the ancient thought of favoritism was but a partial vision of the universal love; to see that the immutable laws of the universe are the complete expression of that Fatherly interest which our ancestors blindly grasped in the dream of miracles. This, however, ceases to be favoritism. Love for *one* child arouses bigotry in it and jealousy in the others. The same love for *all* becomes the perfect tenderness and sympathy, because the happy equality, of the household.

## CHAPTER IX.

## GREEK INFLUENCE.

Alexander conquered Judea and made it a Greek province in the year 332 B. C. For a long time after this the Jews continued their religious loyalty—the priests were supreme in the realm of family and devotional life. Of course it must finally come that Greek culture would detract from the simple-minded Jewish belief; it must come that Greek militarism would fill Jewish hearts with an ambition too obdurate for priestly control; it must come that Greek sensuality would corrupt Jewish manners. Once a priest-ridden people get a wider thought, and begin to think of their fathers' theology as narrow, they break away—and the first break is often not to something better. A narrow circle of thought has its own completed sense of devotion. The first effect of widened thought is often a rupture of devotion.

This Greek influence was met by such efforts as *Chronicles*—by a frantic appeal to manufactured history and blind credulity. The priestly cry, then as always, was: "Do not think; believe and conform." The strictly orthodox, then as always, united with the enemies of religion to denounce reason as irreligious, to regard genius as destructive of faith, to drive worship back to the den of ignorance.

The Jews were inspired by the Greeks to think, but not to think reverently, not to live righteously. They were inspired with ambitions, but not with devout ambitions. By the year 250 B. C. the devout period, the period of psalm writing and temple faithfulness, was coming to a close. Jews had become lovers of war, sensualists, infidel and iconoclastic. The two books which represent the increased intelligence and degenerated morals and religion of that age, are :

*Esther and Ecclesiastes.*

The book of Esther is as terribly out of place among the prophets and dramas and the other novels of the Old Testament as Don Juan would be among a collection of sacred poems. It contains some of the worst things ever put into literature.

The only Jewish festival which was entirely dissociated from religious observance—the feast of Purim—a purely social and benevolent occasion—had grown up during the period of Greek influence. For many centuries the religion and the politics and the social life of the Hebrews had been one and invivisible; and you must appreciate how greatly the priests had lost their hold on the masses when Jews could have a national festival which had no religious significance. The Jewish age of unsectarianism and unbelief had come, when liberty was carried into license. The history of the Greek Olympiads, the constant practice of Greek unreligious festivals, had penetrated Jewish feeling and begotten a love of secularism.

The Jews had not lost the habit of going back to some old period of history to find the origin of every custom. When Hilkiah discovered (?) the book of Deuteronomy in the corner of the temple he had no conception of the imitators that would follow in his path. If they could not arrange to discover a book, (that would be imitating too closely), they could discover a bit of history out of which to make a book.

The book of Esther was written about the year 250 B.C., to account for the feast of Purim. The history out of which the book is made was discovered in the writer's inner consciousness, and discovers him to have been ill posted on Persian history. Esther is represented as a Jewish woman of Xerxes' harem, who became Xerxes' queen about the year 475 B.C. As the reward of her lust she was able to frustrate a courtier's plan for the wholesale massacre of Jews; and she succeeded, by the power of her physical charms with the sensuous monarch, in turning the tables, not only to the extent of hanging the wicked courtier, but of putting the doomed Jews in position to massacre seventy or eighty thousand Persians. The feast of thanksgiving which followed that bloody deed was reckoned by the author as the origin of the feast of Purim.

At the time when this wonderful history is represented as

enacting, about 475 B. C., both Ezra and Nehemiah were living in Babylon. Their silence concerning it is sufficient proof of its falsity. Persian law did not allow the monarch to take a queen except from Persian families of noble rank. It was impossible for Esther to attain that distinction. The proposition that multitudes of Persians would quietly wait the advertised day when an alien race should rise up and murder them is absurd beyond compare. You might as well try to imagine the President of the U. S. proclaiming a day on which the negroes of the South should slaughter the whites—the whites meekly waiting their appointed slaughter. That the feast of Purim, a social and benevolent occasion, could have originated in any such transaction of bloodthirstiness, even had such a thing been, is contrary to all reason. To assume such an origin for such a festival but shows the degradation of the author's moral sense. All men of reverent spirit ought to feel glad that God's name is not mentioned in the entire book—a book that outrages manhood and disgraces womanhood.

The assumptions which previous authors had made for Joseph and Moses in Egypt, doubtless encouraged this author to feel that he could place a Jew in official position quite as exalted at the Babylonian court. The real cases of exaltation—Nehemiah, Josephus, Disreali—should not blind us to such impossibilities as are claimed for Esther, Moses and Joseph. Between these two sets of cases are all the distinctions that separate history from fairy tale.

---

*Ecclesiastes* is the work of some Nihilist of the third century. He represents Greek influence (philosophically speaking,) at its worst, in its most deadly skepticism of and infidelity to all the noblest principles of life. *Proverbs* is the reflection of an unreligious moralist. *Ecclesiastes* is the fault-finding of a cynic. In ch. i. he declares that life is vanity and labor a delusion and enthusiasm a snare. All forms of happiness fail, wisdom is a disappointment, the purest joy is not satisfying. In ch. ii. he finds that luxury is about like toil—a failure; he compares wisdom and folly, with the slight advantage for a wise man that he can laugh at the emptiness of things. He finds riches no better than poverty; he finds

death and annihilation to be the lot of all, with the conclusion that the pandering to our physical appetites and passions is the only good left us: " Eat and drink, for tomorrow we die." In ch. iii. he teaches that God's purpose cannot be known; he doubts if there be any providence; injustice as often holds the sway as justice; it is absurd to look to another world for redress; man is but a wiser beast, with no spirit of the divine or the immortal in him; and he concludes again that the only thing left us is to enjoy the physical pleasures of the passing hour. In ch. iv. he sums up life as unredressed wrong, foolish rivalry, painful isolation, deceptive promise and blasted hope. In ch. v. he gives advice, which consists of maxims by which to avoid some of the evils and vexations that throng our pathway—no aim, no purpose, no hope, no usefulness is intimated. Existence, in all its serious phases, is wrong—avoid as much of it as possible—do not be serious about anything—enjoy your animal pleasures—they will end in pain if you live long enough, but you may die tomorrow and escape the fruits of vice. In ch. vi. he derides ambition, aspiration, all high endeavor, and turns Calvanist of the bluest type, declaring that effort is useless, since all things are predestined. In ch. vii. he comes to one definite proposition, which is that woman must be held responsible for a large portion of the evils of life—woman is supremely bad, impure, untrustworthy. That is the conclusion arrived at by every burnt-out reprobate since the world began. In ch. viii. he proves himself a traitor to his race by counseling meek obedience to whatsoever king may hold them in subjection. Make your peace with the powers that be; patriotism is nonsense; devotion to any idea or principle is a fool's whim. Again we are told that life is an evil and that death ends everything, and we are exhorted to smile at the vanity of things and get what pleasure we can in eating and drinking. In ch. ix. he scorns moral conviction, declares that the virtues of the heroes are not remembered, that money is greater than wisdom and duty, and that death is universal oblivion. In ch. x. he gives the result of cynical observations, with much contempt for common people and a sop of praise for aristocracy. He has found out the way of the world: " Money answereth all things."

Be careful how you criticise kings and rich people. Strange teaching is this, for Bible teaching, if any student yet assumes that all the Bible is inspired of God !

This author betters the instruction of Josiah and Ezra and all the rest, who date their works backward, by himself claiming to be King Solomon. He may have meant it as a deep sarcasm on the pietistic and sensuous old ruler. His work has done much to degrade the builder of the temple and the harem.

The exhortations of the last two chapters—exhortations to benevolence, to faithfulness in our daily duties, to a supreme trust in God for the good outcome of our labor, to earnestness and purity in the days of youth, to obey the commands of God—are so unlike the burden of the other ten chapters: these declarations, of a wise and just providence and of the return of the spirit to God at death, are so different from the bald materialism of the other ten chapters, that we can only conclude they are the additions of a later and better hand. The genius of the ten chapters, their dominant refrain, is to scorn God, to despise his commands, to suspect men, to slander women, to hold virtue and duty in contempt, to live in the passions and be satisfied with animalism.

## CHAPTER X.

## THE JEWISH REFORMATION.

*Judas Maccabœus.*

The last, and one of the greatest, of Old Testament books—the book of Daniel—cannot be understood without a brief review of the intervening history.

Alexander took possession of Palestine in the year 332 B. C. After his death it passed into the hands of Ptolemy I., one of Alexander's favorite generals, who received Egypt in the division of kingdoms, and who was the founder of the illustrious Greek dynasty of Egyptian rulers—the Ptolemies. Egypt was made thoroughly Grecian, used the Greek language, and Ptolemy's court was the favorite resort of Greek philosophers. It was the welcome home of all scholars, and thither flocked many educated Jews. Thither also flocked many trading Jews who were not specially educated. The Hebrew was fast becoming a dead language, especially in Egypt, for all but the more scholarly Jews. Greek everywhere prevailed. For the convenience of their unscholarly brethren, the scholars among the Egyptian Jews translated the Hebrew books of our Bible into Greek. The story of “The Septuagint”—that seventy scribes shut themselves up in seventy separate rooms, each translating the entire Scriptures, finding afterward that they all exactly agreed in their work—is a pretty fiction.

After the death of Ptolemy IV. Palestine was secured by Antiochus III., king of Syria, in the year 205 B. C. In 187 his son, Seleucus IV. succeeded to the Syrian throne. The Jews had become wealthy and vast treasure was laid up in the temple, which many of them loved far better as a safety vault than as a place of worship. Its sacred character did not prevent Seleucus from attempting to rob it. He failed in the burglary, but succeeded to some extent by intrigue with purchasable priests.

Seleucus died in 175 and was succeeded by his younger brother, Antiochus IV., who carried the temple robbery to a shameful extreme. The temple was finally sacked and ruined, and heathen gods were set up in the sacred court. Jerusalem was overrun with hostile armies; wealthy Jews were driven from their homes, which were occupied by favorites of the Syrian king. Disasters continued until the better class of Jews fled in multitudes to all the cities of the Mediterranean—safer, happier, more prosperous anywhere else than in their native land.

These outward calamities, however, were not the most serious threatenings to Hebrew life. Worse than all that was the religious indifference, the spiritual deadness, the loss of faith, the decay of the ancient spirit of worship, the worldliness of the priesthood, the silence of the prophet's voice, the almost universal aping of heathen customs and manners. The Jews had ceased to be a peculiar people, lost their patriotism in the love of money and social recognition. They even became ashamed of their peculiarities in presence of the cultured Greeks; neglected their festivals and ceremonial rites; named their children after Greek gods and heroes; built a gymnasium; purchased and sold the privilege of Greek citizenship. The temple priests themselves were foremost in this heathenizing process. One high priest went so far as to send a present for offerings on the altar of Hercules, the god whose worship was most popular at the Syrian court. The priests were become a nobility, with riches and political power, and they betrayed what integrity there was left in Judaism to the highest bidder. The altars of "strange gods" were in every city and hamlet of Palestine. Wellhausen says: "All that was religiously distinctive in Judaism was to be removed. The Mosaic cultus was abolished, Sabbath observance and the rite of circumcision prohibited, all copies of the Torah confiscated and burnt. In the desecrated and partially-destroyed temple pagan ceremonies were performed, and upon the great altar of burnt-offering a small altar to Zeus Olympios was erected, on which the first offering was made on the 25th Kislev 168. In the country towns also heathen altars were erected, and the Jews compelled, on pain of death, publicly to

adore the false gods and eat swine's flesh that had been sacrificed to idols." Such was the proclamation and such the attempt of Antiochus, who sent an army through Palestine to complete this heathenizing work.

There are always a few faithful souls whom no calamity and no general degradation can overcome. One such, an aged priest, lived with his seven sons in a little village near Jerusalem. The Syrian general heard of this old priest's faithfulness and concluded he would make an example of him. It was time to root out the last seeds of Judaism. Passing through his village the Syrian general ordered him to offer sacrifice on the heathen altar that stood close by. The priest refused. The general threatened. The white-haired old man leapt upon the heathen commander and slew him, and then, with his sons, fled northward into the hills. The story spread, and the little spark of Jewish patriotism flamed up and soon kindled a fire that swept Judea's hills as no fire of patriotism had swept them since the great days of King David.

The name of that old priest was Matthias, and the name of his most famous son was Judas Maccabæus, the Charles Martel, or the Henry of Navarre, or the Gustavus Adolphus of Jewish history. Gathering a band of faithful young men, Judas traversed the land destroying heathen altars by night and fleeing to the mountain fastnesses in the daytime. The governor thought these fanatical Jews would not fight on their Sabbath day, and he sent a company of soldiers who tracked them into the mountains and waited for the Sabbath, to butcher them without resistance. The governor reckoned without his host. Judas fell upon the soldiers and butchered them. Victory brought recruits. Apollonius took the field with his entire army. He was killed and his army cut to pieces. This greater victory brought a multitude of recruits. The son of the old priest organized, armed and drilled them. Governor Seron of Coelesyria came against him with a large army, which the fiery young Cromwell demolished and routed. Judas entered Jerusalem, drove the heathen out, fortified the walls and began the work of cleansing and repairing the temple. The great general, Lysias, sent an army in three divisions to surround and storm the city. Judas anticipated the plan, rushed out on this

side and now on that, repulsing the divisions one by one. Lysias took the field in person, and then it might have gone hard with Judas had not the veteran conqueror been suddenly called away by the death of the king. How like a providence that seemed ! Judas now applied himself to the task of rescuing and re-Judaizing the towns and villages. Out and in, far and near, even as far as to Lebanon and Damascus, he sallied, and carried an awful victory with him wherever he went. In the year 160 B. C. he met the entire Syrian army, under the great Nicanor, and Nicanor was slain and his army cut to pieces. The career of Maccabæus did not pause until Judea was again united and pulsing with vigorous life, until the Jewish religion was powerful and Jerusalem was secure once more as the holy city of the Jews.

---

*The Book of Daniel.*

What has the above history to do with the book of Daniel ? Everything to do with it. That great and patriotic and religious novel was most probably written in the year 165 B. C., during the Maccabæan struggles for liberty and restoration. Its purpose was, by telling the most wonderful stories of how God had helped his people in a former age, and by playing on the popular belief in prophecy and the fulfillment of prophecy, to arouse faith and hope and patriotism and courage for the impending struggle. It seems that there was a belief in the existence, somewhere along in the old Hebrew history, of a man named Daniel, of great repute for his virtue and holiness. He is mentioned by Ezekiel (Ezek. xiv : 14,) in connection with Noah and Job. All these are probably as apocryphal as William Tell and Prester John. This highly uncertain Daniel is located in Babylon at the time of the captivity, and is made the hero of such marvelous exploits as the Jews had learned, in the Homeric legends, to associate with Greek heroes. For startling experiences and miraculous rescues Daniel is quite worthy to be compared with Jason or Ulysses.

Chapter I. introduces the young man, Daniel, as a sort of page in the Babylonian court, a lad of Israelite blood and faith, whom Jahveh favors with miraculous attention. Chapter

II. tells us how the young Daniel interprets Nebuchadnezzar's dream. The image, with head of gold, breast of silver, body of brass, legs of iron and feet of iron and clay, represents the outline of political history (as the writer understood it), from Nebuchadnezzar through the Medean and Persian and Macedonian kingdoms to the Seleucidæ. The stone which smites the image is Maccabæus, or the providence of Jahveh through the instrumentality of Maccabæus. In chapter III. we have the golden image on the plain of Dura ; Daniel's refusal to worship ; his confinement in the fiery furnace ; his miraculous escape ; and Nebuchadnezzar's conversion to the Jewish faith. In chapter IV. Daniel interprets another dream, of the mighty tree that is cut down, in which the King's own fall and insanity are pictured. Then follows the fulfillment of the prediction—the King's seven years' of insanity and his recovery, with a new pledge of loyalty to the God of the Jews. In chapter V. we have the great story of King Belshazzar's feast ; of the handwriting on the wall ; of Daniel's interpretation ; with a bare announcement of Belshazzar's death. In chapter VI. we have a new king, Darius, by whom Daniel is exalted ; we have the decree by which Daniel is unwittingly condemned ; we have the story of miraculous escape from the lions, and the conversion of King Darius to the Jewish religion. So much for Babylonian history, in which there are several mistakes. The siege of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar in 605 B. C. never took place. Belshazzar was not the son of Nebuchadnezzar and was not king. Darius also is an entirely fictitious king. Nebuchadnezzar was succeeded by Nabonidus, and he by Cyrus, the great Persian conqueror. During the four centuries between the captivity and the writing of this book of Daniel, Babylonian history had been seriously forgotten.

The remainder of the book is alleged prophecy. In chapter VII. we are taken back to the time of the fictitious king Belshazzar, when Daniel has a dream of the four beasts—a lion with eagle's wings (Nebuchadnezzar, strong and swift)—a bear (the fictitious Darius, a devourer)—a leopard with four wings and four heads (Cyrus, the intrepid, the cunning and the wise)—a fourth beast with great iron teeth which destroyed everything (Alexander the Great.) This beast had ten horns

(the various rulers which followed the breaking up of Alexander's kingdom.) Among these came up a little horn which spake proud things and prevailed against the saints. This was Antiochus, under whom the temple was profaned and the Jews persecuted. In chapter VIII. are more horns. The ram with two horns is the Medo Persian empire, pushing west. The "notable horn" is Alexander, pushing east. The four horns which follow are the four kingdoms (Antiochan, Egyptian, Thracian and Macedonian,) into which the conquered nations were divided. The "little horn" again is Antiochus, who came into power in the year 175 B. C., and who so cruelly persecuted the Jewish religion. It was the "little horn" who "took away the daily sacrifice," prohibited the temple worship for the space of "2,300 mornings and evenings." As a matter of fact Antiochus destroyed the temple worship in 168, and Judas restored it in 165, in the same month: *i. e.*, the daily sacrifice was taken away but 1,095 days. If the author of Daniel counted both the morning and evening sacrifice it would be 2,190. Our author must have reckoned from some profanation of the temple two months earlier.

Chapter IX. carries us along to the first year of the fictitious King Darius, when Daniel undertook to solve the prophecy of Jeremiah. We are told how Daniel confessed and prayed, and that God sent the angel Gabriel to explain the prophecy. Jeremiah had said (Jer. xxv. 12) that the Jews should be in captivity seventy years. That was a mistake. The Jews were only in captivity fifty years. Jeremiah ventured a grand hope of restoration, giving the round number seventy. It came sooner than he dared hope. The Jews had always been puzzled to figure out Jeremiah's exact seventy. The angel Gabriel is made to explain to Daniel that Jeremiah did not mean seventy years, but seventy weeks of years, *i. e.* seventy weeks, each day of which stands for a year—four hundred and ninety years. This explanation (Dan. ix. 24-27) divides the seventy weeks into three periods—seven weeks, sixty-two weeks and one week. The time begins with the command to restore Jerusalem. Our author possibly had the XXXIst of Jeremiah in mind. He assumed that when Jerusalem was destroyed, in 586, God commanded the rebuilding of it. The seven weeks,

49 days, which represent 49 years, coincide fairly well with the 50 years of captivity. Reckoning to the capture of Babylon by Cyrus it was exactly 49 years. The next period of 62 weeks, 434 days, representing 434 years, the author intends shall bring us down to the attacks of Antiochus on Jerusalem and the assassination of the High Priest, in the year 172. As a matter of fact, not 434 years, but only 364 years intervene between the return from captivity (536) and the attacks of Antiochus (172). Our author has simply made a miscalculation of seventy years. Such ignorance of dates is not surprising, however, in one who has already shown himself so ignorant of the kings about whom he writes. The last period, of one week, seven years, covers the time from Antiochus' attack on Jerusalem (172), to the re-establishment of the temple worship by Judas (165). "In the midst of that week (vrs. 27) he caused the sacrifice and the oblation to cease." It was in 168 that Antiochus prohibited the sacrifice. Thus the great prediction of Jeremiah is made to refer, not to the captivity alone, but to the whole period between Jehoiakim and Judas. It would seem that he considered the whole period from the destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar down to his own day as a time of unfaithfulness. At least two hundred years of that period, from the coming of Ezra to the middle of the third century, was the golden age of Jewish religion, the time of transcendent devotion and unwavering fidelity. Can it be that the author of Daniel was ignorant of that? Perhaps he had a different thought in mind: perhaps he looked for a restoration of the kingdom with a great Jewish king on David's throne once more. Writing, in the midst of the Maccabæan war, soon after the restoration of the temple worship, this may have been his purpose—to inspire the people to make Judas their king.

Chapter X. is a redoubled appeal to credulity, and it prepares the superstitious mind of his age again for a wonderful revelation. The intervention of archangels is nobly wrought. Chapter XI. refers to the four kings of Persia (vrs. 2), to Alexander the Great (vrs. 3), to the breaking up of Alexander's empire (vrs. 4), and to the struggles (vrs. 5-20) of the kings of Antioch with the kings of Egypt; and then to the history of

Antiochus (vrs. 21-45), how he battled with Egypt and encompassed the destruction of Jerusalem. The last verse refers to the death of Antiochus, year 165. Chapter XII. dreams a glorious time to come. Whether the writer means a literal resurrection of the dead or refers to a new life of resurrected religion, it were difficult to say. When he wrote the war was still raging. His heated imagination may have pictured wonders unspeakable. The victories of Maccabæus were to usher in a new order. He was ready to believe things as strange as he had related.

You may call the book of Daniel a deception, if you like; I do not find it in my heart to condemn such a deception at *such* a time. A nation's life trembled in the balance—all Judaism must be aroused to a desperate faith and courage. The moral standards of that age were not as high as they are now. I can imagine no other way in which the man of literature could do so great a work for his country and his religion. It was not an ideal thing in its moral bearings, but it is nobly excusable.

It was to the armies of Judas what the stirring pamphlets of Thomas Paine were to the labors of Washington in the dark Revolutionary days, or what Uncle Tom's Cabin was to the enthusiasm for human liberty during the Rebellion. The overthrow of Belshazzar and the protection of Daniel in the fiery furnace and in the lion's den—how like they were to the providence which disposed of Lysias and Antiochus and which protected Judas in his many battles. As the stories of this peculiar book flew from mouth to mouth men felt that God had risen in his holy wrath once more—the Lord of Hosts again, as in Daniel's time—and was fighting for his people. If people accepted it as a prophecy, four centuries old—as an ancient book which the author discovered—that made its appeal all the more powerful. This remarkable author was not only a patriot, he was a devoutly religious man, and his purpose was to bring back the hearts and minds of the Jews to a faithful worship of God. The success of Maccabæus was but incidental to that great consummation. The coming of the "son of man" was a figure of speech, a personification of religious utopia, by which he meant the faithfulness, once more, of God's chosen people.

*Recapitulation of Dates.*

	B. C.
<i>Jacob's Blessing</i> , (Gen. xl ix.) was probably composed as early as.....	1200
<i>The Covenant</i> , (Ex. xxi—xxiii: 18,) perhaps reached its present form, with few exceptions, as early as.....	1150
<i>The Song of Deborah</i> and the Hero-Stories of the book of Judges were probably put into literary form by....	1100
<i>The Wars of Jahveh</i> and the <i>Book of Jasher</i> , embodied in later histories, were perhaps completed a little before.....	1000
<i>The Acts of Solomon</i> and the <i>Books of Nathan and Gad concerning King David</i> , probably composed before....	900
<i>The Decalogue</i> , in some primitive form, may have been as old as the Temple, but was not put into its present shape, with its lofty moral teaching, until later than..	800
<i>Amos</i> , perhaps completed by.....	770
<i>The Prophet-History</i> , which consists of the story parts of Gen. Ex. Lev. Num. and Josh., belongs to that great literary period of sixty or seventy years in the middle part of the .....	8th Cent.
<i>The Song of Solomon</i> , same period.....	8th Cent.
<i>The Song of Moses and Moses' Blessing</i> , (Deut. xxxii. and xxxiii.) are thought by many to be separate productions of the same period .....	8th Cent.
<i>Psalms</i> , a few, such as the 3d, 4th, 5th, 11th, 20th, 21st, same period.....	8th Cent.
<i>The Chronicles of the Kings of Israel</i> and the <i>Chronicles of the Kings of Judah</i> , embodied in later histories, same period .....	8th Cent.
<i>Proverbs</i> , first collection, (chaps. x—xxii: 16,) same period.....	8th Cent.
<i>Hosea</i> , perhaps completed by.....	745
<i>Zechariah</i> , small portion, (chaps. ix—xi.) about.....	734
<i>Micah</i> , about.....	720
<i>Isaiah, the Great</i> , (chaps. i—xiii: 9, and xiv: 24—xx, and xxi: 11—xxiii., and xxviii—xxxiii), written at intervals during the preceding thirty years, was not completed until about.....	710

	B. C.
<i>Psalms</i> , 46th, 48th, 76th, probably .....	701
<i>Deuteronomy</i> , main body of the work .....	621
<i>Proverbs</i> , second collection, (chaps. i-ix.) possibly as early as .....	620
<i>Zephaniah</i> , probably .....	606
<i>Nahum</i> , probably .....	605
<i>Job</i> , with the exception of the speeches of Elihu, which were a late addition, about.....	600
<i>Psalms</i> , a few, like 42d, 43d, about.....	600
<i>Habakkuk</i> , about.....	590
<i>Jeremiah</i> , written in discourses at different times during a period of forty years, closing with.....	580
<i>Lamentations</i> , separate poems, composed probably during a period of eight or ten years, ending with .....	575
<i>The Law of Holiness</i> , (Lev. xvii-xxvi), the work of several years and several authors, completed about.....	575
<i>Ezekiel</i> , about.....	570
<i>Zechariah</i> , small portion, (chaps. xii-xiv), about .....	570
<i>Judges</i> , 1st and 2d <i>Samuel</i> (originally one book), 1st and 2d <i>Kings</i> (originally one book), were doubtless the work of a generation and were completed about.....	540
<i>Psalms</i> , a few, such as 14th, 51st, 90th, 137th, about.....	540
<i>Obadiah</i> , probably in.....	538
<i>Pseudo-Isaiah</i> , (chaps. xxxiv-xxxv.) .....	537
<i>Isaiah, the Second</i> , (chaps. xl-lxvi), completed about .....	536
<i>Another Pseudo-Isaiah</i> , (chaps. xxiv-xxvii), between 525 & .....	520
<i>Zechariah</i> , (chaps. i-viii).....	520
<i>Haggai</i> .....	520
<i>Joel</i> , about .....	520
<i>Psalms</i> , a few, notably 135th .....	516
<i>The Priestcode</i> , (the ecclesiastical portions of Gen., Ex., Lev., Num. and Josh.) was a long and tedious work, completed about .....	458
<i>Ezra</i> , the memoirs, those parts written in the 1st person, completed about .....	445
<i>Malachi</i> , about.....	440
<i>Nehemiah</i> , the memoirs, those portions written in the 1st person, probably completed about .....	425

	B. C.
<i>Proverbs</i> , a third collection, (chaps. xxii: 17—xxxii), possibly completed before.....	400
<i>Ruth</i> , about.....	400
<i>Jonah</i> , about.....	400
<i>The Pentateuch</i> , put into its present form, by fusing <i>The Prophet-History</i> and <i>The Priestcode</i> , probably later than.....	400
<i>Psalms</i> , the great body of them—the psalms of the Temple and the Law—were composed during the.....	4th Cent.
<i>Chronicles</i> , 1st and 2d, originally one book, first half of the .....	3d Cent.
<i>Ezra and Nehemiah</i> , put into their present forms, containing the edited memoirs, first half of the.....	3d Cent.
<i>Esther</i> , about.....	250
<i>Ecclesiastes</i> , about.....	225
<i>Psalms</i> , 44th, 74th, about.....	167
<i>Daniel</i> .....	165

## CHAPTER XI.

## THE CRITICS.

*In Scotland.*

"No scholar would suppose that Moses was the author of the Pentateuch." So says Max Müller, in the twentieth lecture of *The Gifford Lectures* for the year 1888.

*The Gifford Lectureships* were founded by that noble Scotchman, eminent alike as jurist, judge, financier and religious philosopher, Lord Adam Gifford, who, in the year 1885, bequeathed \$500,000 to the four universities of Scotland—Glasgow, Edinburgh, Aberdeen and St. Andrews—"to establish in each a lectureship for promoting, advancing, teaching and diffusing the study of Natural Theology in the widest sense of that term." The wide sense of that term, Lord Gifford defines as "The knowledge of The Infinite, the knowledge of His nature and attributes, the knowledge of the relations which men and the whole universe bear to Him, the knowledge of the nature and foundation of morals and of all obligations and duties thence arising."

Lord Gifford says in his bequest: "I wish my lecturers to treat religion as a strictly natural science, the greatest of all possible sciences, indeed, in one sense, the only science, that of Infinite Being, without reference to or reliance upon any supposed exceptional and so-called miraculous revelation. I wish religion to be considered just as astronomy or chemistry is. I am persuaded that nothing but good can result from free discussion." This generous and thoughtful donor also stipulated as follows: "The lecturers shall be subjected to no test of any kind, and shall not be required to emit or subscribe any declaration of belief; they may be of any denomination whatever, or of no denomination at all, (and many earnest and high-minded men prefer to belong to no ecclesiastical denomina-

tion); they may be of any religion or way of thinking, or, as is sometimes said, they may be of no religion, or they may be so-called sceptics, or agnostics, or free-thinkers, provided only that they be able, reverent men, true thinkers, sincere lovers of and earnest seekers after truth."

Lord Gifford was convinced that two things are essential to the attainment of truth: 1, absolute freedom and candor of thought; 2, a reverent and earnest love of the true and the right. Heart and brain must work together. Without the spirit of reverence, inquiry becomes hypercritical; without perfect mental freedom, sentiment becomes prejudice and perversion. Dear old Dr. Hemmenway of Garrett Biblical Institute used to pray: "O Lord, give us both faith and reason, for without faith reason is skepticism, and without reason faith is fanaticism." Lord Gifford felt that the ultimate and exact truth of everything is God's clearest revelation, and religion's only safe and enduring bulwark. He was not one of those, characterized by Mr. Savage, who "prate about science and trust superstition; who declare the earth is solid gold but fear to scratch it an inch below the surface lest it turn out brass." He had faith that the universe is founded in the Divine Life, and that the facts of the universe and of human history and experience must establish the most reverent belief in God. He understood that the highest scholarship is required to find and arrange and set forth multitudes of facts, scientific, historic and philosophic, on which a perception of man's complete religious experience may be based. In the true spirit of a judge he dreaded above all things the genius of assumption and special pleading, either for or against. He had perfect confidence in the facts.

The Scotch universities must accept his Lectureships on his exact conditions or not at all. To accept, committed them to absolute freedom of thought and speech, practically prohibited them from longer being sectarian institutions. They should henceforth be, not the thrones of any ism, but the thrones of untrammeled scholarship. It speaks wonderful things for the progress of liberty and rationalism in Scotland that they all accepted the bequests and have met their requirements in letter and in spirit. We can hardly imagine that many of our Ameri-

can universities would accept a theological lectureship in which sectarianism was ruled out and wherein the only stipulations were that the lecturer should be "an able, reverent man, a true thinker, a sincere lover of and earnest seeker after truth." It was in the presence of the faculty and students of the University of Glasgow, and in presence of many leaders of the Scotch orthodox churches, that Max Müller, one of the most profound scholars that ever lived, said: "No scholar would suppose that Moses was the author of the Pentateuch." Scotland not only hears, it nobly seconds, that fearlessness and candor of scholarship. It is enough for the students of Higher Criticism to recall that the land of Knox is to-day represented by *The Critical Review* and *The Expository Times*, and that Prof. S. D. F. Salmond and Dr. A. B. Davidson speak right out from the heart of Midlothian. Scotland indeed is scarcely behind Germany in its rational and scientific treatment of all religious themes. Scotland, the great theological mother, has gotten over her little sectarian fears, and is half a century or more in advance of her American children.

---

*In England.*

Of the two great universities of England, Cambridge has long been considered especially liberal. Cambridge is the English champion of German Biblical scholarship. "Prof. Robertson Smith," says Joseph Henry Crooker, "is by far the greatest Biblical scholar at Cambridge University, if not in Great Britain." Prof. Smith says: "It is sufficient to name Kuenen and Wellhausen as the men whose acumen and research have carried this enquiry (the late date and composite character of the Pentateuch) to a point where nothing of vital importance for the historical study of the Old Testament religion remains uncertain."

Oxford has long been supposed the stronghold of conservatism. In former times it was such, but the *Hibbert Lectures* of Oxford correspond very closely with the *Gifford Lectures* of the Scotch universities. The *Hibbert Lectureship* has given to the world such renowned and rationalistic works as Dr. Hatch's "*Influence of Greek Ideas on Christianity*," and Prof. Sayce's "*Re-*

*ligion of Ancient Assyria and Babylonia*," and Prof. Pfleiderer's "*Paul and Christianity*," and Kuenen's "*National and Universal Religions*," and Rhys Davids' "*Buddhism*," and Renan's "*Influence of Roman Institutions on Christianity*," and Le Page Renouf's "*Religion of Egypt*," and Max Müller's "*Religions of India*." As another indication of what Oxford is doing, it may be noted that our famous Dr. Briggs, with Prof. Salmond of Aberdeen, are the joint editors of *The International Theological Library*, their purpose being to set forth in fifteen or twenty books, by various authors, the ripest scholarship of the nineteenth century, on the great subjects of Biblical controversy. One of the noblest books of this library is entitled "*Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*." Its author is R. S. Driver, D. D., Regius Professor of Hebrew and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford. Professor Driver is by universal consent one of the most profound Hebrew scholars of the world, and his book of 500 closely written pages is the most searching and exhaustive treatise that has ever been published on Hebrew literature. He is very cautious and apologetic, and always inclined to understate his own progressive conclusions. In his long chapter on the books of the Pentateuch he carefully weighs all the arguments that have ever been put forth in favor of the traditional theory, and shows, in the kindest spirit, how weak and how futile those arguments are, and says: "The Mosaic authorship cannot be sustained." Then he proceeds to show that the "Books of Moses" had many authors and a slow growth; that the earliest parts of them were not put in shape for a hundred years after Moses died, and that the latest were not made for a thousand years after the traditional date of the death of Moses. That is the teaching of conservative old Oxford—teaching commonly accepted without a murmur or a thought of dissent in the Church of England. That great book of Canon Driver's is the very first on the list of the *International Library*, edited by Dr. Salmond and Dr. Briggs, for circulation among the orthodox ministers of all churches throughout the world.

Dr. Driver divides Isaiah into three or four books, bringing the latest down to the times of captivity; he dates the book of Job as late as 600 B.C., and rules out the speeches of Elihu; he

calls Ecclesiastes a pessimistic work, and says that "its teachings, as a whole, if followed consistently, would tend directly to paralyze human effort, to stifle every impulse to self-denial or philanthropy, to kill all activity of an ennobling or unselfish kind," and he inclines to the opinion that it was written in the 3d century B. C. He dates Daniel in the time of the Maccabæan wars; with Kuenen, he concludes that the great body of the Psalms constitute "The Hymn-book of the Second Temple;" indeed, the large majority of the dates given in the last chapter are Oxford dates.

---

### *In Holland and Germany.*

The names constantly appealed to by the Biblical students of the entire world, are the names of that great and reverent Dutchman, and that equally eminent and devout German—Kuenen and Wellhausen. These two men have been to the Higher Criticism what Darwin and Spencer have been to the philosophy and evolution. The University of Leiden, founded by William the Silent; nurtured by the fathers of the Dutch Republic; blessed by the patronage of John Olden-Barneveldt; honored by the learning of Hugo Grotius; the mother of great students, from Erpenius to Simon Episcopus and John Marck, has been for three centuries, in a unique sense, the home of advancing Biblical scholarship. It is to-day the great university of the Dutch Reformed Church, and it is from Leiden and for Leiden that Abraham Kuenen speaks. He was born in Haarlem in 1828, entered Leiden in '46, took his Doctor's degree in '51, and was immediately appointed a tutor in the university. In '55 he was given a Professorship, and in the same year married the daughter of Professor Muurling of Groningen, a lady of great scholarly attainments, whose sympathies were with her father's liberalism. Prof. Muurling was the leader of Dutch Liberalism, and young Kuenen was inspired with love and liberality at the same time. He plunged immediately into his life-work—the scientific study of the Old Testament. At the end of six years of laborious research, with all the patience and persistence and thoroughness of which the Dutch nature is capable, he began to write his great work on "*Historical-*

*Critical Inquiry into the Origin of the Old Testament Books."* Of course Kuenen was not a pioneer. Capellus and Richard Simon and Spinoza and Hobbs and others of the 17th century, Astruc and Eichhorn and Ilgen and others of the 18th century, Vater and De Wette and Greisbach and Bleek and Ewald and Vatke and Knobel and others of the first half of the 19th century, had been toiling in the same direction. Kuenen was not a pioneer, but he was the great organizer of the mass of facts and suggestions which all the preceding scholars had heaped up. In 1865, after ten years of ceaseless toil, the *Historical-Critical Inquiry* was completed. M. Renan wrote a preface for the French edition, in which he declared it "the completest, most methodical, and most judicious of all the attempts to give a full view of the results of research into the ancient Hebrew literature."

It was an epoch-making book, but it was not in type before Kuenen felt that a new study was required. He went immediately to work on "*The History of Israel*," and after another five years that masterful book appeared. *The History of Israel*, scientifically speaking, followed the *Inquiry* as Darwin's *Descent of Man* followed the *Origin of Species*, and Kuenen's two books have revolutionized theology as Darwin's have revolutionized science. They are storehouses of learning from which the materials for a thousand books have been drawn; and they present a systemized philosophy of religion, clear, majestic, irrefutable, in the light of which all modern students of the Bible are inspired, and without a knowledge of whose contents, no man can longer be reckoned as a Bible student.

The books by which popular American readers have become acquainted with Kuenen are the three volumes called "*The Bible for Learners*," and which contains the gist of his Old Testament studies. This work is of joint authorship with Drs. Oort and Hooykaas. The great scholar proceeded with his task, and wrote "*Prophets and Prophecy in Israel*," and until his strength failed he ceased not in the labor so lovingly adopted in his youth. His Doctor's thesis in 1851 was an edition of part of the Arabic version of the Samaritan Genesis, and in 1889 he was still revising "*The Hexateuch*." He died in 1891,

after a long and painful illness, and "he was mourned," says Prof. Toy, "by the university, by the city, and by many in all lands who had never seen him."

---

The University of Marburg, the oldest Protestant university in the world, and one of the most famous, founded by the Landgrave of Hesse, (friend of Luther,) and which in the seventeenth century took its place as one of the foremost Calvinistic schools—it is from ancient, Calvinistic Marburg and for Marburg that the leading Biblical scholar of Germany, Julius Wellhausen, speaks. Wellhausen is to Kuenen what Spencer is to Darwin. Darwin and Kuenen collected and arranged facts in systematic order. Spencer and Wellhausen have moulded the facts into rich literary philosophies. Wellhausen's "*Prolegomena to the History of Israel*" deals with life and religion as well as external fact; it is sympathetic, worshipful, affirmative; the kind of a book that makes all religions kin, and wakes the brotherhood of all men.

When the editors and publishers of the *Encyclopedie Britannica* looked about for the one scholar in all the world who was most thoroughly equipped for the great task of setting forth Biblical history in their famous work, they had no difficulty in finding the man. They selected the one in whose transcendent learning and literary genius and reverent spirit the scholars of all nations have confidence—Julius Wellhausen, the beloved disciple of Abraham Kuenen. Go to your *Britannica* and read the articles of Wellhausen on "*Israel*" and "*Pentateuch*" and find the same story that all the great scholars tell—the narrative portions of the "*Books of Moses*" in the eighth century B. C., the body of Deuteronomy in the seventh century, part of Leviticus in the sixth century, the fully developed priestcode in the fifth century.

Time would fail me to speak of Graf, who shares the honor of certain critical discoveries with Kuenen as Wallace shares the principle of evolution with Darwin; of Pfleiderer, of the University of Berlin, whose "*Philosophy of Religion*" is the most comprehensive and instructive yet written; of Strack, who says that the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch is no longer accepted by anybody but Americans; of Schürer, whose "*History*

*of the Jewish People in the Time of Christ*" is a mine of scholarly riches; or of any of that "one hundred great students of the present day," whose learning Mr. Crooker deems perfectly conclusive, and all of whom agree to abandon the Mosaic authorship and the unity of Isaiah, and who treat all the books of the Old Testament historically and naturally as they treat other books.

---

### *In America.*

We Americans, in most regards, are a progressive people, and it has been our boast that we have kept in advance of other nations, but in the matter of theology the average American church and the average American teacher have fallen back to the rear. The churches and the religious teachers of other nations are fifty years ahead of the average American. The great scholarly conclusions which are received as matters of course in France, Switzerland, Germany, Holland, England and Scotland, which the staunchest of church people have come to regard as the common sense principles of religious history and faith, are here looked upon as startling and destructive innovations.

Notwithstanding the keen thrust of Prof. Strack, however, American students are on the way. The greatest periodical of American theology is that famous quarterly review, *The New World*, the religious voice of the Harvard University. Without detracting at all from the merits of any other school it remains undisputed that Harvard is the great centre of progressive theological scholarship in this country. Harvard has followed the example of the great universities of Scotland. In securing its teachers it asks for scholarship and does not ask to what church they belong. When it wanted the best Old Testament scholar in the country it found him in the Baptist church. Crawford H. Toy was the name of him. Harvard took him. An article from his pen in a recent number of *The New World*, on Abraham Kuenen, would, of itself, go a long way toward ranking American scholarship with German. When that article, together with Professor Toy's book on

"*Judaism and Christianity*," shall have become familiar to the American clergy, a new religious era will begin.

When Prof. Shurman, (a Baptist, now President of Cornell,) writes a book so philosophical and so brimming with the rational spirit as his "*Belief in God*;" when Prof. Harper, another Baptist, (then of Yale, now President of Chicago University,) says "the scholars of Germany seem to have settled these questions;" and when Presbyterian Prof. Briggs publishes Episcopalian Dr. Driver's scholarly rationalism; and when Congregationalist Prof. Moore, of Andover, commends the German Graf; when such books as Sunderland's "*The Bible—Its Origin, Growth and Character*," and Chadwick's "*The Bible of To-day*," and Crooker's "*The New Bible and Its New Uses*," are coming rapidly from the press, it begins to look as if American scholars are to be included, and that Prof. Strack's thrust should be withdrawn.

---

What does it all mean? Is Higher Criticism destructive criticism? Can we believe or imagine that the greatest universities of France and Germany and Holland and England and Scotland and America, that the *Encyclopediæ Britannica* and the *International Theological Library* are banded together in an awful and world-wide conspiracy to destroy the religious faith of Christendom? One of the greatest statesmen that England ever produced was modest enough to say that he could not find an indictment against a nation. We may safely smile at the temerity which finds an indictment against the combined scholarship of half a dozen nations.

What are the scholars trying to do? They are trying to get at the truths and facts of history. They are convinced that religion, the same as morals and education and science and art and politics and trade and every other human interest, is better served by knowledge than by ignorance; that the church of the future will be more safe in the hands of reason than in the hands of superstition. These men of the higher criticism, French liberals, German rationalists, Dutch independents, English Episcopalians, Scotch Presbyterians, American Baptists and Unitarians, have been moved to their tasks by a pur-

pose that was profoundly moral and sacredly religious. Every one could say, as truly did Jesus : " I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil." With the single exception of Renan, I do not believe the world has produced another set of men who were at once so scholarly and so devout as the men of the higher criticism. Renan has always been a man of literature rather than a man of prayer. He must be ranked with Strauss and Matthew Arnold. No man who knows anything about them can believe that any of the three has been other than honest and truth-loving. For all the rest, they are men of the most worshipful character, men of the most profound faith and hope, whose pages warm the heart with generous love and noble faith while they lift the mind above the fogs of superstition into the sunlight of religious truth.

*CHAPTER XII.*

## INCIDENTAL RESULTS.

The direct results of Higher Criticism are such facts of authorship, date, circumstance and meaning as have been indicated in the preceding chapters. The incidental results are such changes of theory and conviction and popular sentiment as naturally grow out of these facts. Incidental results are always more important than direct results. The direct result of Jesus' preaching was to inspire a small minority of the Jews with a decided feeling that conduct and character were more divine than the rites and ceremonies of the Temple : the incidental result was the establishment of the Christian Church. The direct result of the labors of Petrarch and Boccaccio was the resurrection of the classic literatures of Greece and Rome : the incidental results were the humanizing of modern thought, the dethronement of theology, the secularizing of European ambitions, the growth of science and popular education. The direct result of the voyages of Columbus was the discovery of West India and South America : the incidental results were the colonization of the new world and the transformation of the old. The direct results of the labors of Darwin are the denial of spontaneous life in the vegetable and animal world ; a recognition of the facts of living parentage for everything that lives, the development of new species from old by differentiation, the survival of the fittest and the eternal law of progress : the incidental results are denial of creation and miracle, and the substitution of evolutionary forces and procedures in such wide form as to embrace man, mind, civilization, religion and immortality itself. The incidental results of Higher Criticism will be a readjustment of theories concerning the Bible; nay, a complete revolution of theology ; the abandonment of the old and the substitution of a new philosophy of revelation and providence.

*The "All or None" Theory.*

This venerable theory of the Bible, which is only a bluff to frighten the timid and rouse the prejudice of the ignorant, declares that everything written in the Bible is true, or else, that we have no reason for believing that anything it contains is true. If the account of creation in Genesis is not scientifically correct, we have no right to suppose that the golden rule is ethically correct. If you doubt the historic reality of Jonah's exploits, you have no reason for accepting the historic reality of Paul's missionary tours. If Samson was a myth, you may as well say that Jesus was a myth. If it was not right, as recorded in the 137th psalm, to take an enemy's little child and dash its brains out against a stone, then it is not right, as recorded in the fifth chapter of Matthew, to love your enemies and do good to them that hate you. If God did not approve and bless Jehu for a massacre as black and loathsome as St. Bartholomew, as the tenth chapter of Second Kings tells us he did, then you have no right to believe that God approved the purity and charity of Christ, as the entire New Testament declares.

If you had a friend who applied that theory to any other book in the world you would feel worried—not about the book but about your friend. In the works of Byron and Burns and Walt Whitman are some things that a respectable man ought to be ashamed of having written; will your friend, therefore, denounce everything they have written as base and disreputable? All students agree that Macaulay misrepresented William Penn; will your friend, therefore, denounce everything that Macaulay wrote as false and slanderous? All artists understand that the old Italian masters were guilty of serious blunders in their painting of trees and in the general arrangement of their foregrounds; will your friend, therefore, assume that the old masters did not know how to paint the human face and figure? You will be inquiring whether some ancestor of that friend did not die with softening of the brain.

The *All or None* theory claims that the Bible is infallible and inerrant. There is no mistake as to historic fact and no error as to moral teaching in the entire book. On that dangerous and ridiculous foundation, the defenders of the faith

take their stand. In order to show you how frail and how foolish is their challenge, it is not necessary to recall that some parts of the Bible contradict science, that some parts of it contradict history, that some parts of it contradict morality, it is enough to remember that upon the greatest and most vital questions with which it deals, the Bible contradicts itself.

The first great subject treated in its pages is "Creation." There are two accounts. One in the first chapter of Genesis, and one in the second chapter. These two accounts contradict each other at every point. The first chapter says that creation occupied six days: the second chapter says that it occupied one day. The first chapter teaches that the new-made earth was covered with water: the second chapter teaches that the new-made earth was so dry that vegetation could not grow. The first chapter teaches that vegetation and animals existed before man: the second chapter teaches that man existed before animals or vegetation. The first chapter teaches that man and woman were created at the same time: the second chapter teaches that man alone was made, then vegetation and animals were produced, then the Garden was planted, and after all of that woman was made. We need not pause to ask which of these accounts is true, or whether they are both guesses—the one important fact, which any child can see, is the impossibility that both can be true.

One of the most important themes with which any book can deal is the nature and character of God's dealing with men. In the Old Testament God is often represented as tempting men to do wrong. We are told that he tempted Abraham, that He inspired Jacob to dishonesty, that He hardened Pharaoh's heart, that He incited the Israelites to get possession of jewels and rings under false pretenses; that he taught Moses to deceive. Of course, people would become ashamed of such religious teachings as that, and in the New Testament it is denounced as false. "God cannot be tempted of evil; neither tempteth He any man. Let no man say, 'I am tempted of God.' He is tempted when he is drawn away of his own lust." We sympathize with the New Testament, but that is not the point. The point is that the Bible contradicts itself, and that both teachings cannot be true. Will you say that in the Old Testa-

ment times God did tempt men, but that in the New Testament times he did not? Then let us turn to one particular act, of which we have contradictory accounts in the Old Testament itself. You remember the story of how David once numbered the people for the purpose of finding out how many soldiers he could muster. He took the census that he might enforce the draft. And you remember that for doing so a pestilence came and killed 70,000 of his men. Now, the question is, Why did David make that wicked census? Who induced him to do it? Turn to the twenty-fourth chapter of Second Samuel and read that God "moved (*i. e.*, inspired, induced, commanded, tempted) David to number the people." Now, turn to the twenty-first chapter of First Chronicles and read the contradictory account. There you are told that it was Satan who "provoked" David to number the people. Whether this account or that is any more or better than the childish theory of a primitive intelligence is not the issue. The issue is that the two statements contradict each other, and both cannot be true.

If you were to ask any Evangelical believer what is the supreme subject with which the Bible deals, he would instantly reply, in one word—"Christ." If anywhere in the Bible, and on any subject, we should expect absolute agreement between the different writers, it is in the Gospel accounts of Christ. The simple fact is, however, that the Gospels begin their story with mutual contradictions. In the second chapter of Matthew we are told that Herod was still living at the time of Christ's birth, and that the wicked king was seeking to kill the infant Christ, and that, to avoid Herod, Joseph fled with the young child into Egypt. In the second chapter of Luke we are told, by implication, either that Herod was dead or that he had not the slightest disposition to harm the child of Joseph and Mary. We are distinctly told that the child was not taken to Egypt at all, but was taken to Jerusalem and publicly presented in the Temple, and from there was taken to his parent's home in Nazareth. The question is not which of these accounts is true, or whether there was anything more than a floating and irresponsible tradition for either account. We are not dealing with *questions* just now. We must face the simple *fact* that both of these accounts cannot be true.

We would all say that there is no other subject with which the Bible deals that is more important than the question of future life. Turn to Ecclesiastes and read: "The dead know not anything, neither have they any more reward. \* \* \* \* There is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom in the grave whither thou goest. \* \* \* That which befalleth the sons of men befalleth the beasts; even one thing befalleth them all; as one dieth, so dieth the other; yea, *they have all one breath*, so that a man hath no pre-eminence above a beast." There you have it—as bald materialism and as blank denial of the future life as ever was written. Turn over to Corinthians and read: "As we have borne the image of the earthly we shall also bear the image of the heavenly \* \* \* for we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved we have a building of God, eternal in the heavens. \* \* \* O death! where is thy sting? O grave! where is thy victory?" Our souls leap up at these triumphant words of St. Paul and claim them as divinely true. But if they are true the words in Ecclesiastes are false.

---

### *The "One Book" Theory.*

When you speak to a child or a child-like man about *a book*, he naturally concludes that it was written by a single person. When you explain to him that it was written by seventy-five or a hundred different persons, he concludes that all of them worked together with mutual understanding and purpose. When you tell him that these various authors were scattered over a period of a thousand years, he gropes for a dim idea that there must have been some kind of supernatural direction, that one great mind must have kept the oversight and superintended the work. There must be unity of teaching—how else can it be *a book*? When you explain that every great subject dealt with by these various authors is differently treated—that one writer is a materialist and another a stout believer in immortality—that one attributes an act to God which another attributes to the Devil—that one says all human suffering is punishment for sin while another says it is God's way of strengthening and blessing the good—that one teaches the

resurrection of the body and another flatly denies and ridicules it—that one teaches the miraculous conception of Christ while another tells us that Joseph was his father—that one proclaims the law of retaliation, “an eye for an eye,” while another denounces that law—that some claim God as the god of the Hebrews only, having no love or care for any other people, while some teach that He is the Father of all—when you make it plain, as Higher Criticism does, that there is no unity of teaching among the various Bible writers on a single great theory with which they deal, even a child must confess that the Bible is not *a book* but *a literature*.

When the fragmentary character of nearly all the Old Testament writings, especially, is pointed out, and men become convinced, as Higher Criticism convinces every man who dares to read, that psalm and prophetic exhortation and history are often broken and patched, mere collections of disjointed paragraphs, then it must be concluded that what we have in our Old Testament is but the remains, from many a destruction, of what constituted, at various periods, Hebrew literature.

Suppose you took a chapter from *The Lives of the Saints* and a few great sections from Dante's *Inferno*, and Calvin's *Five Points*, and Luther's *Theses*, and two or three of Wesley's *Sermons Against Calvinism*, and a few of the choice poems of Browning and Tennyson and Longfellow and Whittier, with some Unitarian sermons by King and Savage and Blake; a few of the broad and brotherly editorials by Lyman Abbott, and the creed of the Universalist church, and Emerson's essays on *Worship* and *Religion* and the *Over Soul*—suppose you should bind these all up in one cover and send the book to the interior of China and tell those people that it was the Christians' Book of Religion—the Chinamen would find several kinds of Christianity in it, wouldn't they? Suppose you told them that every word of it was true, or that none of it was true. They would make note of the contradictions and come to a conclusion, wouldn't they? If there were some higher critics among those Chinamen they would say to the people, “This is not one book, it is a collection, it represents the growth of Christian thoughts and feelings through several centuries. Emerson is not responsible for these absurdities in *The Lives of the*

*Saints.* Whittier and Abbott and the Universalist creed are not responsible for Dante's thought of hell or Wesley's belief in God's infinite wrath or Calvin's estimate of the Divine vengeance. *Try these various spirits, prove these writings, test these beliefs and hold fast that which is good.*"

That is what Higher Criticism is doing for the teachings of the Bible. It is simply showing that the Bible writers, age after age, wrote what they believed; that there is a progress of thought and moral sentiment as age succeeds age, and that one author is not responsible for what another has written.

Still we have people in the world who ask: "If there are errors in the Bible, how then do we know there is truth, and how shall we know what parts of it are true and what untrue?" Well, my friends, I do not believe in capital punishment—not even for stupidity—and so I shall continue to explain. If March is not a delightful month how can you know that June is delightful? If disease is not enjoyable how do you know that health is enjoyable? If such characters as Quilp and Fagan and Pecksniff are not ideal, how do you know that you ought to think well of John Jarndyce and Florence Dombey? If *Don Juan* is not exactly the thing you wish your boys and girls to read, how do you know that it will be safe for them to read *Snow Bound*?

Any frail human being who has judgment enough to decide between these things has judgment enough to decide between the 137th Psalm and the Golden Rule; has judgment enough to decide between Ecclesiastes and Corinthians; has judgment enough to decide between the book of Esther and the twelfth chapter of Romans; has judgment enough to decide between the character of Solomon and the character of Jesus. All that any man needs is to cut loose from the "all or none" theory and the "one book" theory and *exercise* his judgment.

You might as well say that because Benedict Arnold was a traitor there has never been a patriot in America, as to say that a mistake committed by Ezra vitiates a truth uttered by Paul. You might as well say that because the wild flowers are not blooming in December there is no beauty of a June landscape, as to say that the moral crudities of Genesis destroy the moral perfections of the Sermon on the Mount. Suppose the story

of Washington's hatchet is a legend, what has that to do with Washington's honor as commander and president? Suppose the stories about Christ's birth are legends, what has that to do with His character and teaching? When you are prepared to say that Washington was a fraud unless the hatchet story is historic, then say that Christ's teaching is not to be trusted unless the angel-stories of His birth and resurrection are historic. Higher Criticism proceeds on the innocent assumption that when men become acquainted with the facts of the Bible they will apply the same common sense to its teachings that they exercise in reading all other books.

---

### *The "Miraculous Revelation" Theory.*

Two things are necessary in order to make any theory of miraculous revelation seem reasonable, even to give any faint excuse for its existence :

I. It must be shown that the revelation teaches something which men could not learn otherwise.

II. It must be shown that the thing taught is of supreme importance.

Whatever the peculiar form of theory may be : that God wrote the revelation, as people used to believe He wrote the Ten Commandments on the tables of stone with his finger ; that in some miraculous manner he dictated its words to the human writers, as people used to believe concerning the prophecies ; that in any mysterious way He suggested ideas to the human authors, or so impressed their feelings as to direct and superintend the work, as our modern apologists vaguely hint—however the miraculous revelation is conceived, it must prove itself by these two signs : that its teaching could not be arrived at by natural means and that said teaching is of supreme importance.

What are the supremely important teachings of the Old Testament ? The moral commands and exhortations, the denunciations of crime and vice, the doctrine of the One Righteous God, the teaching of providence and worship. Can it be justly claimed that these sublime teachings require a miraculous

revelation? It might be so claimed, with at least a show of reason, if the Hebrews were the only people who had them; but that is not the case. No student of history can doubt that Hindoos (especially Buddhists) and Egyptians had as noble and fine moral teaching as the Hebrews. The Egyptians had that moral teaching centuries before Moses, or even Abraham, was born. The belief in providence and the practice of worship belonged equally to Egyptians, Hindoos, Persians, Greeks and Romans. The thought of the One Supreme God is much older than any Hebrew writing, much older than the Hebrew people. We must either confess that a miraculous revelation was given to all these other peoples, or that the Hebrews were the only people by nature devoid of great intelligence or deep moral feeling. It is a sad comment that they could only get by miraculous revelation what all others attained by the use of their native intelligence and feeling. One of the most supremely important ideas in religion is the thought of man's immortality. The Old Testament is the only ancient literature in which that is not clearly taught, the Hebrews were the only people who did not have that sublime conception of the soul as a daily inspiration. The conception of the Infinite Spirit is the only thought man ever had which is greater than the thought of immortality: no other thought is to be compared with it. This grand idea, the Hebrews were practically without. Of course, they had hints of it and hopes toward it, but it was no part of their religious system. Is it not strange that other nations, all heathen peoples, could get that sublime thought naturally, while even the miraculous revelation did not impart it to the Hebrews?

Perhaps it is not these general ideas that people have in mind when they speak of the Bible as a miraculous revelation. It is quite probable that the average mind reverts to what is called the Plan of Salvation. All men were lost in Adam; no man can be saved except by faith in the Atonement. The purpose of the Bible is to reveal this universal condemnation to endless woe, and this only means of escape by faith in Christ's death. If that is true it is infinitely the most important thing conceivable. Of course, man could know nothing about that universal doom and that means of escape unless it

were miraculously revealed to him. What judgment is passed in the secret thought and purpose of God, what effect on God's feelings and plans the death of Jesus might have, what awaits the unbeliever millions of years hence—men can easily surmise these things, but no man could *know* anything about them without a miraculous revelation. If, from the beginning, there was such a doom and such a means of escape, we may well suppose that God would make a miraculous revelation to acquaint his children with the infinitely important facts. That, we are told, is exactly what He has done in the Bible. That is what the Bible is for.

Let us see. The human race was lost in Adam. Men began to die, and to pass into that everlasting torment. It was immediately planned that the Atonement should be made, four thousand years hence; but its virtues could be anticipated by faith. Since judgment was fixed and the means of escape provided, the revelation ought to have been made, right there in the Garden of Eden, before Adam and Eve had time to get sick. We are told that Jahveh came and talked with them about many other matters—but not a word about the endless woe to which they were doomed, or the means of escape. Fifteen centuries roll by; men and women and children by the countless millions have passed on ignorantly into eternal Hell; Jahveh comes again and talks familiarly and often with Noah, about the things of this life; works marvelous miracles to preserve Noah's physical existence a few years longer on earth—but not a word about the endless doom to which his beloved Noah and all the rest are hastening. Another five centuries roll by, and Jahveh is represented as talking, times without number, to Abraham and Lot and Isaac and Jacob and Joseph; talks about all the common affairs of this world; works miracles by the score for these people in whom he is so peculiarly interested: they and the whole human race are passing on to the remediless woe—not one word about that awful and certain doom, or the provided means of escape. Other centuries roll by, and Jahveh is represented as continually associating with Moses for at least eighty years, talking with him daily, guiding his hand or his thought in the writing of five long books; writing about morals and worship, about history and war and politics,

about architecture and manufacture ; explaining with unspeakable minuteness how a sacrifice must be prepared, how a portier should hang, how a priest should dress, what kind of hair-oil he should use ; working miracles every day to prove his wondrous love for these doomed people—but not a single word about the everlasting doom which waited them, or the means of escape—chapter after chapter concerning the most trivial and infinitesimal concerns of rite and ceremony, but absolute silence concerning even the fact that there was any existence whatever beyond death. Other five centuries roll by ; Jahveh has often talked with men, and now he is continually with David and Solomon for another sixty or eighty years ; inspires David to write many hymns and prayers and songs of praise ; gives unto Solomon such wisdom as man never had : two or three billions of people have died and gone to Hell while he was holding frequent communion with David and Solomon ; they will follow soon ; he loves them well enough to work constant miracles for them—but not a single word about that Hell of endless torment to which they all are doomed, or the means of escape. Three more centuries roll by, and the great prophets, like Amos and Isaiah and Micah, have spoken their word as Jahveh commanded them ; the noblest parts of the Old Testament are written ; everything that Jahveh wished to communicate to mankind is written, exactly as he wished it : humanity is marching on to its doom ; three or four millions every year are tumbling from the brink of death into endless Hell ; Jahveh is doing all sorts of miraculous things every year to help his beloved along with their wars and their politics and their temple service—but not a word about the unending torment of the future, or the means of escape. Other centuries roll by ; the Old Testament is completed ; inspiration ceases ; Jahveh comes no more to speak with men ; he has said all that he has to say to the Hebrew people—which is nothing at all that other peoples did not know just as well without any revelation : death is mowing down his six or seven billions every century ; the Devil gets everybody ; Heaven is still empty ; the ages of special providence are past ; there is to be a long, long silence in which Jahveh will not visit the earth ; the miraculous revelation is now a closed book—but in it all not one single word, that any-

body understood, about the universal doom or the means of escape. Theologians go back and imagine they find a few vague hints of these important matters, but the people to whom Jahveh spake did not observe any hint. He did not even succeed in arousing their curiosity about the future. The entire matter could have been explained to a child in one sentence; but here is the Hebrew race, especially selected to receive this miraculous revelation of Hell and the Atonement, and at the end of thirty-six or thirty-seven centuries of revelation they have not the faintest conception of it. They are even less interested in the existence beyond death than any other intelligent people on the face of the earth.

I have used the word *Jahveh*, not the word *God*, for that relieves the feeling of blasphemy which would make me uncomfortable even in reciting a repudiated theory of such moral turpitude. That men could think of God as knowing such a doom and the means of escape, as perpetually speaking to his children about other matters and keeping silent about this, were enough to drive the whole world pell-mell into atheism. I feel that I am writing about a myth, such as Apollo or Athena, when I write of the Hebrew *Jahveh*. The name of God is unspeakably sacred as the life and love of the universe, the Infinite Father of the human race. I no more identify him with the *Jahveh* of the Hebrews than with the *Jupiter* of the Romans.

---

### *The "Miraculous Prophecy" Theory.*

When it was believed that Moses wrote the Pentateuch, speaking about the kings of Israel several centuries before there were any kings of Israel; when it was supposed that Isaiah wrote the last twenty-seven chapters of the book which bears his name, speaking of the remnant that should return from captivity two hundred years later; when it was reckoned that Daniel himself was the author of the book of Daniel, describing kingdoms and wars four centuries in advance—then of course, people thought the Hebrew writers were gifted with supernatural vision, with a miraculous power of gazing into the coming years and ages. Higher Criticism has shown that

in all these great instances the writings were produced after the events. If there are any minor instances of like nature, a more careful study will probably show the same result. There is no proof that Hebrews could see into the future any further or more clearly than other people. There is vast assumption both by themselves and by Christians on that point, but no proof. The so-called prophesies of Christ in the Old Testament are the gratuitous interpretations of Christian theorists. Jews never did and do not now understand them so. All those sayings which are twisted into descriptions of his person and life, plainly refer to other matters. Those which have been made to apply to his gospel or church, refer simply to the ideal Jewish kingdom, the purified and perfected nation and religion, which Jews dreamed for themselves, just as Greeks and Romans and French and English and Germans and Americans and Catholics and Methodists and Unitarians, and all other people, dream and appeal to the ideal time when their nation or church shall be purified and powerful as they would like to see it. Such a dream, such a picture of idealism, in any literature, can be applied, with a little pressure, to any great moral reformation or any great religious character. All that the Jews hoped and dreamed for their Jewish religion, Christian theorists have claimed as prophecy of the Christian religion. The spirit of assumption is not wanting in that claim. Mohammedans could apply the same prophetic dreams to Mohammed, Buddhists could apply them to Buddha, with equal justice.

---

*The "Miraculous History" Theory.*

If Dante needed no help of miracles to write the *Inferno*, why should it be supposed that the authors of the Hebrew psalms needed any miraculous help? If Gibbon needed no miracles to assist him with the *Decline and Fall*, why should the authors of the Pentateuch need any? If Plato and Shakespeare got along without special Divine aid, why could not Isaiah and Micah? If no supernatural inspiration was required for the production of *Faust*, why should any be required for the production of such books as Ruth and Job? In like

manner ; if the Pilgrim Fathers came over here from Holland and founded a Republic in the American wilderness without miraculous aid, why couldn't a band of Hebrews travel from Egypt up to Canaan and establish themselves among the Canaanites without miraculous aid? If Cortes needed no miracles to help him conquer Mexico, and Alexander needed no miracles to help him conquer the entire world, why should David need miracles to help him conquer the barbarian hordes about Palestine? If the Egyptian monarchy could endure nearly five thousand years without any Divine assistance, why couldn't the Hebrew monarchy endure five hundred years without Divine assistance? If Brahmins and Buddhists and Confucians and Parsees and Catholics and Protestants could found their own churches and make their own theologies and build their own temples and conduct their own worship without miraculous aid, why couldn't the Hebrews do the same? How does it come that unaided men could build up such a marvelous organization as the Roman Empire, while it required the constant intervention of superhuman power to keep the little Jewish organism from extinction ?

But it is said that Jewish history records these countless miracles ; so does Catholic history ; so does Greek and Roman history ; but we do not grant *their* miracles ; we can understand their history, we can see the forces and account for all the facts, with the miracles eliminated. Hebrew history is just as easily accounted for without miracles.

---

*The New Appreciation of the Bible.*

Let us clearly understand that Hebrew Literature was not written for the world ; that it is Jewish history and tradition which the Jews wrote for themselves, with no more idea that it would be used by other nations as a religious text-book than Bancroft and Whittier had that their history and poetry would be so used, two thousand years hence, by some nation yet unborn. Let us clearly understand that whatever genius there is in the Old Testament was simply the genius of the Hebrew people. The people, not their writings, are deserving of praise, as if these writings had something which the people had not.

The Hebrews were not a people of specially great ideas. Their science was exceedingly crude, even for their day; their histories are blundering, even as histories went in that old time; their poetry is to the poetry of Greece and Rome about what Whittier is to Shakespeare; their philosophy is lame and halt and broken and patched; their theology does not indicate any wide intellectual grasp. One thing in the Hebrew people was remarkably great—their moral conviction. They were a people of moral conviction, as the Greeks were a people of artistic sense and as the Romans were a people of conquering and organizing genius. Their theories of what was right and what was wrong, of how things are right or wrong, were often very primitive, but their deathless love of right, put into their literature, illustrated by their traditions and legends and myths and histories and biographies and novels and poems and rites and ceremonies of four thousand years—that is what made their literature so great. That sublime sense of righteousness, embodied in almost everything they wrote, is what has kept the Bible alive and made it the world's text-book of ethics and devotion.

From the story of Eden to the Sermon on the Mount, the almost constant theme of Hebrew penmen is righteousness. Other nations had moral precepts as great and fine—the result of a few grand moralists—but no other *people* were so alive to the sense of morality. Hebrews looked upon morality as the greatest thing in the universe—the thing for the sake of which the universe was managed. All their theories of history, of nature, of God, were subservient to and moulded by this supreme conviction of righteousness. Their very mistakes in history and science and theology accord with this conviction, for they conceived that all providence was a daily or yearly rewarding of the good and punishing of the evil, and their conceptions of what were good and evil were often erroneous.

If you begin with the Book of Genesis you will find that everything is accounted for on moral grounds. The whole human race became sinful because the first man was disobedient. Suffering and death entered the world as divine punishments of guilt. When this old writer looked about him, he saw what all men saw in his day; that woman was the chief

sufferer in the world, that she was generally the slave of man; and he accounted for that sad fact on the supposition that Eve had been more guilty than Adam. When he looked out upon the poverty and wretchedness of the world, the toiling for bread, the sweating brows of the multitude, he considered it God's retribution for the sins of our first parents. Death itself, to his thought the supreme calamity of the universe, was also a retribution. All these things were sent as the punishments for sin. They never would have been had man not sinned. We have other theories now to account for these, but we must not forget the profound moral conviction, the lofty belief in God's moral government, which inspired the Bible writer. The evils in the material world itself—how are they to be accounted for? To what are the briars and thistles and poisons and pestilences and earthquakes and cyclones due? The old Bible-writer made his God say to the sinful man: "For thy sake the earth is cursed." Geology teaches us a different lesson. These things were present in the earth before man appeared. The Bible writer was not a scientist, but we may profoundly respect that moral sense of his by which he saw the whole creation governed with reference to man's moral condition.

If we enlarge our view sufficiently we may explain all things on the Bible-writer's principle—not on his *theories*, but on his *principle*. For one, I do not believe that man was an accident in an accidental world. Carry back the geological history of the earth as many millions or billions of ages as you please, I still believe that this earth to-day is exactly the kind of an earth God meant it to be, for exactly the kind of a human race that is now upon it. I believe it is the best possible world for this human race. A more perfect earth, in which there were no poisons and heats and frosts and sickness, might do better for a race of sinless beings; but this earth rebukes laziness, requires toil, compels study, rewards knowledge, blesses the man who keeps the laws of life, inspires all progress and punishes all disobedience. When we look at it in the light of ages and millenniums, we shall have a different theory from his, but we shall understand these things only by applying the principle of that old Bible-writer—the universe is managed in the interest of morality.

We look at general laws and can only make general statements. We do not see a special purpose in each separate event, as he did. He accounted for the flood on moral grounds. The human race was washed away because men became very wicked. In all Semitic races there was the old tradition of a flood. I suppose it was the lingering memory of the real geological floods of the glacier epoch. Geology shows that those floods were terrible in that part of Asia inhabited by the Semitic races. We think of it as an event in the evolution of the earth. The author of Genesis made it a direct punishment of human sin.

It is entirely possible that in some ancient time there was a sinking of the Dead sea country. In that calamity some ancient villages may have been engulfed. The old tradition is worked into the story of Sodom and Gomorrah. Not being a scientist, not knowing anything about geology or natural law, the Bible-writer gave a moral explanation. It was the punishment of vice, and the story does not fail—Bible stories never do fail—to reward all the virtue there was.

The story of the shortening of human life, from almost a thousand years to three score and ten, is a graphic presentation of the well-known fact that vice drives people to an early grave, and that purity lengthens the term of life. The longer we study the social problem, also, the more truth we see in the principle that the human race suffers for the crime of its first parents. Of course all human suffering is not due to crime, even in the most general statement; but the crimes of representative men, men at the centres of power, do entail a vast amount of grief on humanity. Think of the suffering that came to America from the early importation of slaves! Think of the suffering that cursed Europe from the tyranny of kings and popes! Think of the sufferings of workingmen and sewing women from the inordinate greed of men already rich! Think of the horrors of a war that is produced by a few great politicians!

Whatever else they failed of having, these Bible-writers had the eternal secret of life and providence—the conviction that God created the world and humanity for the sake of righteousness—that evil must always and everywhere work destruction

and misery—that virtue has the pledge of the Infinite himself for its rewards. That is the faith which made the Bible, and that is the faith which has produced all the virtues of human history. A book through which that faith breathes and pulses cannot lose its sacred hold on the hearts of men, however theories change. Follow the Bible right through and you will find that evil is always punished and virtue always rewarded, (always excepting the books of Esther and Ecclesiastes.) Abraham is faithful, and the desire of his heart is rewarded by the miraculous birth of a son. Jacob lies to his father, and then he suffers the deceptions of Laban. He becomes true, and God abundantly blesses him. Joseph's virtue is lifted on high and becomes the saving power of his people. After all the great deeds of Moses and all his Divine rewards, he is not suffered to enter the promised land because he once proved faithless to Jehovah. Sampson lost his power by dallying with vice. David's cruelty was brought home to him in the death of Absalom, and his meanest act ended in his bitterest grief. Solomon, blessed above all men for his love of wisdom and his obedient spirit, lost the glory of his kingdom through unrighteousness. Read the stories as they are, from the author's standpoint; you may not agree always with his ideas of what goodness is or what punishment is, but you will find that he always rewards goodness and punishes crime. In that noble sense the Bible is "a book of moral winnowedness."

In the firm belief of the historians and the prophets, every king failed who was bad, and every good king succeeded. When the nation was righteous God gave it prosperity, but its unrighteousness was visited by calamity. In the conviction of those writers morality was the centre and soul of everything. God looked only at the heart. All the blessings of heaven were pledged to the virtuous. They believed that all the elements of nature were so directly and miraculously controlled as to reward and punish men. Rich harvests, plentiful vines, timely rains and fair winds were given to the good. Blight, mildew, disease, frost, drought and flood were visited upon the bad.

That childlike faith, so full of danger to all faith, was a sweet and happy comfort to them. It was such a simple and heart-

felt dependence on the good God who loved nothing else as He loved goodness in His children ! Of course the material aspects of that simple faith must be given up. They could not help seeing that some bad men were fortunate, that some good men were great sufferers, that some wicked nations were strong, that their own faithfulness did not prevent their own national weakness and obscurity.

They changed their theories of suffering and reward, but they did not give up the principle. They began to say that God made good people suffer that He might make them still better, might purify them and make them perfect through sufferings. That was one of the grandest things ever said of Jesus—that “He was made perfect through suffering.” The apostle prays that he may have the fellowship of Christ’s suffering that he may also be glorified with him.

After the Babylonian captivity, the rewards of righteousness are no longer considered outward and material but inward and spiritual. God will make the faithful Jews the religious teachers of the world ; by their griefs they shall touch and purify the hearts of all nations ; their tears and sorrows shall wash away, as in a flood of love, the sins of the whole world ; they shall become “ beautified within ;” heathen peoples will flock to Jerusalem and worship the true God, drawn thither by the sanctities of Jewish life and conduct ; brotherhood and kindness will destroy cruelty as the sun drives away the night ; by the power of brotherhood, war shall cease ; the lion and the tiger shall become gentle and a little child shall lead them—that is the noblest expression of moral Utopia ever uttered—innocence shall conquer power—love shall quench barbarism. To be good, to do good, to make the whole world happy, even in its sufferings, by purifying the souls of men—that was the new dream of the reward of righteousness which filled their minds after the captivity.

The theory had changed, but the Bible principle remained the same. Morality was everything. God’s providence was all for the virtuous. In that great sense the Bible is one book. The same grand faith in the good outcome of morals, the same conviction of the misery to follow wrong-doing, runs all through it, is the basis and the inspiration and the crowning glory of it.

When we come into the New Testament the scene changes again—changes from earth to heaven. The punishments and the rewards are new, are celestial, are to come beyond death; but the spirit of the Bible remains the same. Heaven is for the good. Hell is for the bad. The pure in heart shall see God. Those who visit the sick and feed the hungry and clothe the naked and soothe the prisoner and comfort the fatherless, shall be received at God's right hand. The good, who come up from all nations of the earth, shall be given a happy welcome. The children of the kingdom, if they be not righteous, shall be rejected. Whosoever gives a cup of cold water or shows himself a brother to the "least," will be accepted of Him. The Publican who repents, the Samaritan who is kind, the Roman whose heart is right, the Syrian who loves virtue, the reformed outcast, the heart-stricken thief, are the chief examples of New Testament salvation. God's blessing rushes out to meet the returning prodigal. A pure purpose opens the fountains of Divine reward. The constant refrain of the Gospel, like the melody of "Home, Sweet Home" running through a symphony, is: "Be merciful, be unselfish, be kind, be pure, and great is your reward in heaven." The liar and the tyrant and the hypocrite and the selfish and the hard-hearted shall be cast into outer darkness. Another new theory of rewards and punishments we have in the Gospel, but it is the same Old-Testament faith that the destiny of man is fixed by his moral quality.

The Old Testament laid stress on actions, assuming that if conduct is right the heart is right. The New Testament puts emphasis on motives, assuming that if the heart be pure the conduct will be pure. Jesus had no invention of government or church to filter the waters of conduct; he would purify the fountain of sentiments. It was his direct belief that "a good tree cannot bear evil fruit." He carried this principle of inward purity to the pitch of absolute idealism. "Be ye perfect even as your Father in heaven is perfect." If men complain that such idealism is impractical, Jesus would answer them as John Ruskin answered the English architects when he demanded certain changes in the interest of their art, and they cried out "Impossible!" "Oh," said he, "it is not the impossibility

of it that I am talking about but the indispensability of it." Jesus never considered "practical" questions. To His divine enthusiasm the ideal was indispensable. Moral perfection was God's eternal purpose. It was for that the earth and humanity were created. It was for that the life of this world and the world to come were granted. That was the task to which the Eternal Father set himself. That was the meaning and purpose of providence. That is God's reason for everything He does, God's reason for everything that man suffers, the goal toward which all creation moves, the consummation of the events of time—moral perfection.

That, as I am able to read it, is the very soul of Bible teaching. That is what makes the Bible the religious classic of all ages. That demand for perfectness places the teaching of Scripture at the summit of life. We may fall below it, far below it in our schemes for the "practical," and we may rise again in our enthusiasm toward it; but human thought and feeling can never rise above it.

This moral teaching of Christ, which was a natural development along the same line of the moral teaching in Genesis, must stand while the world stands as the final and complete word of life.

Everything in religion draws life from that doctrine of moral perfectness. It determines our thought of humanity—what an exalted nature man must have, what divine abilities, when such demand can be made of him! It determines our thought of God—how glorious, how patient, how full of love must be his nature, to set this ideal as the end of his work! It determines our thought of the future—what an infinite meaning there is in the life beyond death, if that life also is for the sake of completing God's purpose! How far we are below perfection in this world! What ignorance and sin are yet in the souls of men when they die! What a grand thought, that rewards and punishments, teaching and experience, are to be continued until the Gospel demand is fulfilled! What an overwhelming idea, that God's word, "Be ye perfect," shall be held aloft as the command of eternity until it is obeyed and every soul shall come into the spirit of it!

That is my conception of the Bible. Its mistakes are mis-

takes of theory, as when the prophets taught that morality would avert earthquakes and mildew; but the central principle of it, ceaselessly insisted on from Genesis to Gospel, amid all changes of theory, is this highest truth that ever entered the mind of man—this truth, that the purpose of creation was righteousness; that the life of man, and the fashioning of the whole material universe, and God's action from eternity to eternity; that everything on earth and in the heavens, material and spiritual, past and present and future, was and is and shall be for the sake of morals. A book with that sublime conviction at the heart of it, had it a thousand mistakes of scientific theory and historic event and theological speculation, must yet be the book of books.

---

### *Revelation.*

"I think Thy thoughts after Thee." Such is the revelation of God's wisdom to man. Divine intelligence is revealed to human intelligence, manifests itself in human intelligence. The facts and forces and laws and purposes of the universe are recognized by the man of scientific genius. These things are never told; men discover, through their own study and development and culture, the plans of God in matter and life. How the Almighty conceived and realized a solar system, how He arranged for and brought to pass the kingdoms of vegetable and animal and human existence, by what devices He calculated and has compelled the growth of civilization—the revelation of it all comes to man's intelligence. Intelligence can only be revealed to intelligence. The revelation grows and brightens in the exact ratio of human ability and the exercise of thought.

It must be precisely so concerning the moral nature, the feelings and purposes, of God. Divine emotion is revealed to human emotion, manifests itself in human emotion. The justice and pity and love of God are recognized by the man of moral genius. These things are never told; men discover, through their own moral developments and culture, the plans of God in humanity and for eternity. What is the ethical meaning of our existence; how we can fulfill our destiny and

his purpose ; what is right and brotherly ; what salvation is and is to be ; the entire plan of a soul, with its possible excellencies—the revelation of it all comes to man's moral nature, as that nature is developed and refined. Morality can only be revealed to morality. Righteousness and love can only be revealed to righteousness and love. The moral sense of man is a mirror, more or less perfect, in which the Divine nature and purposes are reflected. Man's moral sense, like his knowledge, is a growing thing. As we find it recorded in the Bible and in all other literature, in the laws and customs and manners of human society, the moral sense is always enlarging and refining. It is crude and feeble in all primitive races. In the early stages of its evolution it can reflect but a poor and distorted conception of the Deity, as a half-polished and badly-soiled plate of metal can only reflect a dim and blurred outline of your own face. With every new development of the moral sense, it reflects the Divine character in clearer outlines and broader proportions. In an age when the moral sense is so feebly cultured that men see nothing wrong in slavery and polygamy and capital punishment for heresy, the popular conception of God will be very untrue, or but partially or inadequately true—like a child's notions of astronomy. Only the moral sense that has grown to something like perfection can truly represent God, as only the widest and most exact knowledge of the scientist can reveal the infinite facts of astronomy.

It is impossible for men to think of God's morality except in the terms of their own moral experience. Men will never think of God as kind to his enemies (if it were possible for him to have any) until they have learned how to treat their enemies kindly. It will never occur to men that God's love is universal until they have developed at least the desire to put all vengeance out of their own hearts. The average moral sense of any age will determine the popular estimate of God. People never think of God as being any better than their own secret purposes. It is impossible that they should. An artist will see a thousand beauties in a landscape or a sunset to which the plodding farmer is blind. It requires an artistic soul to appreciate the Divine art. It requires a pure soul to appreciate the Divine purity. "Spiritual things are spiritually discerned."

When you find such a morality as Jesus lived and taught, you may trust the conception of Deity which it reflects upon the world. The man who can put the golden rule into his daily feeling and conduct is able to comprehend somewhat worthily the eternal goodness. Whether that man lives in the first century or the nineteenth, in Christendom or heathendom, he is capable of teaching great truth about God's feelings and providence. His own character is a mirror that reflects with wonderful accuracy the character of his Maker. He is the only man whose word is to be relied on as anything like a complete or final revelation.

This is the great principle of interpretation laid down by higher criticism. We must read every book and sentence of the Bible in the light of the age which produced it. If we find that God is represented unworthily, that words and actions are attributed to him which we now see would be wrong, we must simply remember that the moral standards of the nineteenth century are higher than the moral standards of the ancient world. Many things that were once considered as virtues we have come to look upon as vices or failings. Every age attributes its highest sense of virtue to God.

Such feelings as jealousy, egotism, vanity, self-love, which we condemn as unworthy of a noble character, were not anciently condemned. They were admired and delighted in as the proper feelings of the great. Selfishness and the spirit of tyranny belonged to a king, as his crown and sceptre. Without them, with kindliness and modesty, a king of the olden time would have been despised as a weakling. The vanities, egotisms, mutual hatreds and deceitful schemings of the Greek gods were quite in keeping with what the Greeks admired in great men. It did not occur to John Calvin that he was dishonoring God when he laid it down as the first principle of theology that God does everything for his own glory—thinks of nothing from eternity to eternity but his own glory. Calvin does not mean it as a dishonor when he tells us that God will eternally damn the great majority of his own children, just because it will show forth the glorious majesty of his power. Calvin's moral sense belonged to the dark ages. That was the sort of thing he admired in great men. That was the sort of

thing he admired in himself when he plotted the death of his friend Servetus.

The gods of all ancient nations, Hebrew included, have been represented as demanding worship. First and foremost in all the old religions is the god's demand that people shall fall abjectly before him, and humble themselves in the dust, and adore his power and beg his mercy. In every old religion the gods are represented as demanding the best and choicest of everything for themselves—the first fruits of the flock and the herd and the field and the vineyard—not because the gods had any use for these things—not that they needed anything to eat or drink—but that man should be constantly humiliated before them. To our moral sense there could be nothing more repulsive than such a demand, but it was not repulsive to the ancients—it was delightful to them. That wanton and haughty display of power was what they admired in their kings and princes. They thought the gods were actuated by the same personal ambitions and passions for glory which rankled in the breasts of great men. The entire system of sacrifices, the foundation of all ancient religions, is thus an expression of man's belief in the self-love of the gods. They must be coaxed and begged and richly rewarded before they would grant the slightest favor. That was kingly. A king's favor is a precious thing. It is not to be granted lightly. You shall be made to feel how great is the condescension when he stoops to bless a worm of the dust like you. That was the ancient idea of greatness in men or gods. It is a supreme relief when we can read these things in the Bible and understand that we are simply reading the history of man's primitive moral sense. Higher criticism has conferred no greater boon than to relieve our worship of these crudities. When the moral sense of the Hebrews became more highly and finely developed, these crudities were put away. The prophets tell us that God is weary of sacrifices, and that He demands truth and righteousness. Jesus declares that God is not like a jealous king, but like a good father who knows what we need before we ask him, and who accepts our kindness to the poor and the afflicted as love offered to himself. Indeed, if all of Jesus' teaching about God could be put into one word, that

word would be *self-forgetfulness*. This idea alone makes worship possible to a free intellect and a refined moral sense. A man of freedom and refinement cannot worship by command, any more than he can love on the threat of instant death. Love and worship will not be compelled, cannot be given to those who require them as their right. Worship will be full and free and beautiful, when we feel that God is infinite benevolence, making no demand for himself; just as love is unbounded to one who gives himself in kindly service and asks nothing in return.

We have a proverb—a questionable proverb now—which says “The end justifies the means.” To the ancient Hebrews it was not questionable—the end both justified and glorified the means. They held that it was not only excusable, it was right and a solemn duty to do wrong that good might come of it. They did not *excuse* Abraham’s falsehood to Abimelech about Sarah; they did not *excuse* Moses’ falsehood to Pharaoh about going into the wilderness to sacrifice; they did not *excuse* Jehu’s treachery with the heathen priests; they did not *excuse* Jael’s assassination of a sleeping soldier or Esther’s harlotry and bloodthirstiness in her dealing with Xerxes—instead of *excusing* these deceptions and massacres as we would, if we could, on the ground of military necessity, they gloried in them as matters of principle, and taught their children that God was well pleased with such principles of conduct, just as we teach our children the opposite. They were not satisfied with complimenting their heroes for such conduct; the Old Testament refers the inspiration of such conduct to their god. In the name of all that is honest and honorable under the heavens, why should we believe such Bible teaching when we know it is wrong!

It is well to clarify our moral sense on this question of right and wrong. Wrong is not made right even by a military necessity. When evil becomes necessary, as it sometimes does, let us be perfectly candid about it; let us call it what it is, a necessary evil; let us not call it right. Let us make that distinction clear and get all of the old traditional fog out of our moral sense. It is sometimes an evil necessity to kill men. It is never right. You who were soldiers did not kill men as a

matter of principle. It was an evil necessity. When the thought of the world becomes perfectly clear on that point, morality will take a sudden and long stride forward. Religion will take a still longer stride forward. Men never attribute a military necessity to God. They attribute to God only what they recognize as a principle of morality. Not any necessary evil, but the eternal right, belongs to the Divine character. The Hebrews attributed all sorts of wickedness to God, because they did not understand the difference between a necessary evil and the eternal right.

The Hebrews did not individualize crime as we do. They held an entire tribe or nation guilty for any offense that might be committed within its borders. Our American Indians had the same dullness of moral sense. If a white man of any village wronged an Indian, every man and woman and child of that village was held responsible. Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet* pictures the same moral stupidity of the feudal ages. Every Montague held every Capulet responsible for the offense committed by any Capulet. Hebrews had no conception of a war between armies, as we now have. With them it was a war between tribes or nations; and the war was not ended until the tribe or the nation was exterminated. They had no more compunctions about killing women and children whom they had taken captive than modern Christians have about killing men in the heat of battle. Any modern government would censure a general for turning ten thousand prisoners loose to go back into the enemy's ranks the next day. Any government would censure a general for drawing off his army from a half-won field because he dreaded to kill more men. That is exactly the way the Hebrews felt when David neglected to massacre the women and children he had captured in battle. He should go on and complete the conquest—annihilate the accursed tribe. Women would till the ground while men fought. Boys would soon grow into soldiers. We make a moral distinction between warfare and massacre. Hebrews did not. Indians do not. Catholics did not, when they sang *Te Deum* over St. Bartholomew. Just as the Christians of this age link the name of God with their national wars, and sing praises when they read that ten thousand of the

enemy have been slaughtered, the Hebrews linked the name of God with any foulest massacre, and felt that they were honoring him when they made him the author of it. Because Hebrews were angry with David for not murdering the women and children, the Bible teaches that God was angry with him on the same ground. If we are not quite so barbarous as they were, let us give the character of God the benefit of our moral progress.

Man's moral sense is his only revelation of God's character, and when that moral sense is dull the revelation will be distorted. It is a great relief to understand the case, to know where all our thoughts about the character of God come from—to know that there will be a perfect revelation when, and only when, the world shall grow into perfect morality. There is no other kind of revelation except this, which arises in the mind and the moral sense of man. The only authority in religious matters that any Bible-writer has, that any man can have, is the authority of knowledge and reason and of moral intuition and culture. God never speaks; man grows into a larger and truer apprehension of him. All the immoralities of Hebrew thought and conviction are ascribed to their god. Later on, when some of these immoralities are recognized as such, we find them ascribed to their devil. With all their weaknesses, we must recognize that the Hebrews, when compared with other races, were a people of exalted moral sense. Above all others, they had a *progressive* moral sense. The pre-eminence of the Bible is its faithful record of this growing moral sense of the Hebrews—a moral sense which grew and refined until it put forth the Sermon on The Mount.

---

### *Inspiration.*

We say that the beauties of nature inspire an artist, a poet, a lover. Ocean and mountains inspire even a plodding soul. The stars and the intricate facts of the microscope inspire the astronomer and the naturalist. The history of human struggles for liberty and the rights of man inspire us all with patriotism. Heroic devotion and self-denial inspire us to courage and unselfishness. What is it to be inspired of God? Exactly

these, and like things. God is in all and through all. Nature's beauty is his; nature's grandeur is his; man's goodness is his; the mother's love is his. His life is in all; by his life all is sustained. The soul lives by ceaseless contact with him. By whatsoever in nature or humanity we are lifted to higher life, it is the Divine quickening. The farmer digs a well and strikes a vein of living water; it is surmised that there are electric currents in the upper air by which we could communicate with other continents without the bungling device of an Atlantic cable; the earth itself is so magnetized by the universal presence of some inexplicable force that the compass-needle is always drawn to the north: the Spirit is not less wonderful. Our spirits, in the deep and high and inmost regions, come into life-touch with the Eternal. Inspiration tells nothing; it exalts and illumines, comforts and strengthens. The desire to learn, the love of purity, the mood of prayer, put us into vital communion with the infinite, immanent Holiness and Peace.

---

### *Providence,*

like inspiration, is God's immanent life and activity. A tree grows because God's life is in it. A planet develops from chaos because the Divine life is in it. There is human progress because God's laws and forces compel a ceaseless evolution of intelligence and virtue. The exhaustless earth is providence. Human needs and aspirations are providence. Circumstances are providence. When we get over the weakness of miracles, everything is providence.

---

### *The Issue.*

Higher Criticism makes the fair and square issue with traditionalism. That issue cannot be stated too clearly. Evangelical theologians claim that the Bible is revelation. Higher criticism claims that man's moral sense is revelation. Now, of course, if the Bible and man's moral sense were in perfect agreement the theologians and the critics would have no practical differences. I say "*practical* differences," but I

say even that with much caution. If every command and teaching of the Bible were in perfect accord with the ideal morality of the golden rule, there would still be a vast philosophical difference between the theologians and the critics—a difference which might become practical. That primary difference between the two sets of thinkers concerns the simple question of cause and effect. Was the Bible the *cause* and man's moral sense the *effect*, or was man's moral sense the cause and the Bible an effect? Did the Bible produce Hebrew religion, or did Hebrew religion produce the Bible? That would still be a very important question, even if the Bible and ideal morality were in perfect agreement. Of course it becomes the vital question when there is developed the slightest difference between the Bible and moral sense.

Higher Criticism teaches that the Bible is an effect; that it was produced by Hebrew religion; that it was written by men, just as all other books have been; that it is composed of the thoughts and feelings of the men who wrote it.

“Out from the heart of nature rolled  
The burdens of the Bible old;  
The litanies of nations came,  
Like the volcano’s tongue of flame,  
Up from the burning core below,—  
The canticles of love and woe.”

Whatever there is in the Bible came out of the burning experience, the surging thoughts and emotions of the Hebrew people. In whatever they were right it is right.

Theologians claim that the Bible had some miraculous origin outside of and distinct from the experience of the Hebrew people; that its authors are not to be credited with its idealisms nor held responsible for its immoral teachings. They tell us that when the Bible and reason disagree, reason shall surrender; when the Bible and the facts of science are not in accord, the facts of science must be counted out; when the Bible and the noblest emotions of the human heart come into conflict, the heart must be discredited. Higher Criticism teaches exactly the opposite. It declares that when the Bible and reason, the Bible and science, the Bible and the cultured feelings of the heart, are at variance, reason and science and heart shall stand. When the Bible says there were one hundred

and forty-four thousand sheep and oxen slain as sacrifices, inside of eight days, at the dedication of Solomon's temple, reason denies it. When the Bible tells us that the shadow of the sun went backward on the dial, science denies it. When the Bible teaches that a Sabbath-breaker or a witch or a disobedient son shall be killed, our moral sense denies the teaching. When the Bible says that sick people will be cured by the prayers of the elders and by anointing them with oil—at any rate we would not trust the prescription for small-pox and cholera. When the Bible says that "believers" can handle scorpions and drink poison with impunity—well, there are certainly no "believers" left. When the Bible says: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned"—there were Darwin and Emerson and Lincoln and Lowell and Whittier, unbelievers and unbaptized, and we should enjoy beholding, as a mere natural curiosity, the preacher who would dare to face an intelligent audience and declare that these men are now in Hell.

Let the statement be made just as plain as English words can make it. Higher Criticism does not test science and reason and moral feeling by the Bible; it puts the Bible to the constant test of science and reason and moral feeling. Whatever these condemn it sets aside as untrue. Whatever these confirm it accepts as divine. The truth which the Bible contains is infallible and inerrant—not because it is in the Bible, but because it is truth. The same truth is just as infallible and inerrant in the Koran or the Vedas or the Books of The Dead or Shakespeare or Browning or Walt Whitman.

"Truth is divine, wherever found,  
On Christian or on heathen ground."

The Bible is diviner than other books, in just so far as it has more truth than other books—divine in no other sense.

The only way to determine what is true in moral teaching is the test of experience. The golden rule is glorified, not because Jesus uttered it, but because it proves itself divine in every day experience. Jesus himself is not set on high because of any miraculous or superhuman quality, but because his moral and intellectual merits demand the world's reverential affection. Higher criticism agrees most heartily with conserv-

ative Presbyterianism that the great teachings of Jesus, as set forth in the Sermon on the Mount, are infallible and inerrant. Higher criticism bows at the altar with evangelicalism before the authority of every established principle of life, and it regards every moral and spiritual truth as having within it the sacredness of God's life and loving presence.

---

### *The Tyranny of Texts.*

Concerning all those parts of the Bible which can be demonstrated as true and good, there is no disagreement. All of that is God's word. There is so much in the Bible which human experience has demonstrated to be true and good that no man need to fear this ancient treasury of religious life and moral purpose will ever be neglected. The Bible lives because it is worthy to live. It is the world's devout classic. That is the only reason why any book or painting or musical composition or form of architecture ever comes to be known as a classic. It has so much truth or beauty that the world will never be able to get along without it.

Urging all of that as heartily as ever the orthodox churches urged it, the critics understand that there are errors, mistakes, wrong teaching, contradictions, in the Bible, and those things the critics will not accept as God's word. You recall the use that Matthew Arnold, in "Literature and Dogma," has made of the German word, *aberglaube*, "extra belief." Allow me to say that the *common belief* of theologians and critics alike is belief in those moral principles which human experience has demonstrated. All together accept these as divine. *Aberglaube* will represent the "extra belief" of theologians in the divineness of the errors and mistakes of the Bible. Belief in the infallibility of Bible truth is the world's moral salvation. There is no other kind of salvation. Belief in the infallibility of *aberglaube* has filled these eighteen centuries of Christian history with hatred and persecution and war. *Aberglaube* has been the supreme enemy of knowledge and political liberty. Infallibility for those things which do not accord with reason and moral sense—that has been the tyranny of the ages. It

was that which destroyed the magnificent literatures and the classic arts of Greece and Rome. You remember the saying attributed to Omer when one of his generals captured Alexandria, and asked what should be done with the great library. "Burn it," replied Omer; "for if the books accord with the Koran they are unnecessary; and if they are contrary to the Koran they are pernicious." Everybody knows that the first part of the reply was hypocritical. Men do not destroy the treasures of literature because they accord with what is believed. All such treasures are the more ardently treasured. Omer had a deep suspicion, or a clear conviction, that the Alexandrian library would not accord with the *aberglaube* of the Koran. Mohammedans had learned from Christians how to fortify their Scriptural mistakes with the doctrine of infallibility. The Christian church was thoroughly convinced that science would not agree with the Biblical *aberglaube*, and that is why Galileo and Bruno were persecuted; that is why Copernicus delayed the publication of his treatise on astronomy more than thirty years—he wanted to live; that is why Darwin and Huxley and Spencer have been so bitterly assailed. The church is perfectly aware that higher criticism is not in harmony with *aberglaube*, and that is why the church denounces the great modern scholars. The reason why criticism is always replied to with personal abuse is perfectly plain—there is no other way of replying to it.

---

*The Ground of Hatred and Persecution.*

*Aberglaube* means not only the doctrine of infallibility for Biblical mistakes, but the doctrine of infallibility for all those conflicting and extraordinary texts of the Bible which lie outside the regions of demonstration. It is this particular *aberglaube* which has created the ceaseless commotions inside of Christendom itself. The churches all together hate critics from the standpoint of infallibility for immoral and unscientific and unreasonable texts. The churches hate each other from the standpoint of infallibility for those doctrinal texts which contradict each other, and whose truth or falsity on either side can never be demonstrated.

Just think of the hatreds between the Protestant churches and the Catholic church ; the full hundred years of battle and the shedding of millions of human lives. One of the theological reasons for that conflict—and all the other theological reasons were like it—was a dispute as to whether the flesh and blood of Christ were present in the communion wafer. Was there a constant miracle by which the unseen and intangible essence of the Master's body always graced the sacred elements? By the confession of both parties it was forever impossible to decide whether or not that secret miracle had been wrought. Here was a text that seemed to favor it; there was a text that seemed to deny it; and such was their belief in the infallibility of texts that countless millions of men were ready to die for their side of a problem which they all knew could never be solved.

Look at the conflicts of the Calvinistic and Arminian churches, which kept the social life of Germany and England and America in a very bedlam of quarreling and vengeance for two more centuries. Higher criticism is not hated by anybody to-day as bitterly as Methodists and Presbyterians hated each other two or three generations ago. Their quarrel became a sort of hereditary feud in every village and neighborhood, and the very children were taught to despise each other. What was it all about? Here are some Bible texts that teach man's free agency. There are other texts that teach foreordination. Arminians hated as if they were doomed to it, and Calvinists hated with what looked like the freest and most deliberate purpose of their own. Of course, nobody could tell, or ever can tell, whether the laws of life are such that every human action is the scientific effect of a series of causes which run backward to infinity. Bible writers differed on that subject, just as writers do to-day; but our fathers believed the infallibility of texts, and each party planted itself on those texts that favored its side of the problem, and closed eyes to all texts on the other side, and they hurled the Bible at each other and kept on hating.

The Baptist churches waged a long and bitter fight with the other evangelical churches for the same kind of a reason. Here were texts that favored immersion. There were texts that

favored sprinkling. There was no possible means of deciding whether one form of baptism was more pleasing to God than the other. Both parties believed in the infallibility of the texts which favored their belief, and they kept on fighting until the common sense of the world was disgusted and they were shamed into silence.

The Christian world and the Mohammedan world have been at war a great portion of the time for twelve centuries. The foundation of that war was the doctrine of the Trinity. Of course it is impossible for human beings ever to know whether God exists as Trinity or Unity. The earlier parts of the Old Testament teach polytheism. The later parts teach that there is one God. The New Testament almost constantly teaches the one divine person. There are a few texts which may be made to mean Trinity. Every scholar knows that the Christian church received its doctrine of Trinity from the Greeks. On the infallibility of those few texts which may be twisted into Trinitarianism and which contradict hundreds of other texts, the Christian world has waged twelve centuries of war, destroyed billions of human lives, wrecked the property of nation after nation, kept humanity for a full thousand years in a state of barbarism.

For sixteen centuries or more the Jews were hated and persecuted with a spirit of vengeance never exceeded by savage tribes. Why? Because they, like the Mohammedans, would not give up their grand old belief in the unity of God, as the Christian did, and accept the Greek speculation of Trinity.

For seventy-five years the Evangelicals and the Universalists of America waged a bitter warfare, in which personal misrepresentation and slander played a most unseemly part, because there are texts which favor eternal damnation and other texts which favor the final holiness and happiness of all mankind. Each party claimed infallibility for the texts it loved and explained the opposite texts into thin air.

You know that the moon always presents the same side to us; we never see the other side, and never shall. A very thoughtful writer tells us that the moon is pear-shaped, and that the power of the earth's gravitation always holds the big end towards us. That reason seems reasonable, but until it

can be demonstrated let us not quarrel about it. When it is demonstrated of course we shall not quarrel about it. Suppose, however, that there should arise schools of theorists concerning the other side of the moon ; that one school should declare its surface to be a dead level, while another school declared that it had mountains ten miles high. Suppose that the "mountain" school should subdivide into several sects ; one believing that those invisible mountains were composed of old red sandstone ; another believing them to be solid masses of blue limestone ; another claiming that they are built of Quincy granite. Suppose that all the people of Europe and America should divide on the question and join these various sects. Suppose that great social organizations should be constructed on the foundations of this and that belief. Suppose these organizations began to denounce and traduce each other as heretics, infidels, enemies of the true faith. Suppose they came to war on the subject, and should fight about it for the next three or four centuries, until all the civilizations we have built up in these modern times were destroyed, and the people of the twenty-third century should find themselves again in the barbarism of the fourteenth century. What would the people of the twenty-fifth century—supposing them to have come to their senses—what would they think of such an issue ? About what the men of higher criticism think of the sectarian wars and hatreds of the past and the present. Four hundred years of war about the invisible things on the other side of the moon would have as much reason and as much religion in it as twelve centuries of war on the doctrine of Trinity, or two centuries of hatred on the question of whether man's free will was foreordained, or one century of vengeance on the problem of immersion.

---

*What Higher Criticism is Good For.*

It is good for the common sense and the peace and the prosperity and the brotherhood of mankind. It will destroy this foolish doctrine of infallibility for two texts which contradict each other. It will shame out of existence this supreme folly of going to war, or of hating your neighbor, on the strength of some speculative notion, the truth of which can

never be demonstrated. It will relegate to the limbo of eternal scorn the idea, or the fear, that God can be the author of any teaching which is not morally perfect. It will finally establish the doctrine that man's cultivated moral sense is the true medium of revelation: and that will do away with sectarian hatreds.

We can hardly imagine the moral progress and the happiness that would come to the world in the next hundred years, if the churches would cease to expend their energies in sectarian quarrels and trials for heresy, and should stand shoulder to shoulder in the work of helping their fellow-men. That consummation, so devoutly to be wished, can never be brought about while churches cling to the infallibility of Bible texts which contradict each other, or contradict science, or contradict reason, or contradict the moral sense.

Men do not quarrel about things that can be demonstrated. They make the demonstrations and abide by the results and call them divine. Moral principles have been demonstrated. Higher Criticism pleads with the world to accept them as God's principles.

There would be no quarrel about things that cannot be demonstrated if men understood they were human and fallible speculations. There will always be different beliefs about what is unknowable. As long as men claim to have God's authority and command for their special theories about the unknowable, there will be hatred and persecution. When all such differences are recognized as simple differences of theory, the good time of peace and religious brotherhood will come.



## *"PHASES OF RELIGION IN AMERICA."*

By W. S. CROWE.

"A particularly fresh and suggestive treatment of many of our most pressing religious problems. These lectures treat the following subjects:

- I. Puritanism, or the Religion of the Book.
- II. Methodism, or the Religion of Experience.
- III. Episcopalianism, or the Religion of Symbols.
- IV. Universalism, or the Book against the Book.
- V. Unitarianism, or Humanity against Tradition.
- VI. Theism, or the Revolt from the Materialistic Revolt.
- VII. Spiritualism, or the Religion of Demonstration.
- VIII. Ethical Culture, or the Religion of Agnosticism.
- IX. Reform within the Churches, or the Religion of Interpretation.
- X. The Concensus of Reason and Emotion, or the Religion of Eclecticism.
- XI. The Problem,—Is God Good?
- XII. The Method,—How God works.
- XIII. The Hope.

From the statement of these subjects the general scope of the book will be gathered. But the insight, keenness, and strength with which all the themes are treated, can be understood only by reading the book itself. If any one would know what is the trend of the most radical and at the same time the most reverent religious thought of our time, we do not know where he will find out better than from these fascinating lectures of Dr. Crowe."—*The Unitarian*.

A busy business man writes: "Few theological books would keep me awake, but *Phases of Religion in America* robs me of sleep like a first-class novel or play."

"We wish that we could quote more largely from this book. We have marked enough passages to fill a page of the *Times*; and they all sparkle with gems of thought, and with that powerful diction of which Dr. Crowe is a master.

We are not sure that Dr. Crowe's platform will suit every one, but the new Christianity appeals to the rational interest of mankind and it will work a revolution in the old theology, if not an entire change."—*Newark Daily Times*.

"There are many eloquent passages in each lecture. . . . The rhetoric is glittering, but never turgid; earnest and fascinating, yet characterized by tranquil dignity. . . . The book is so temperate and kindly that, though men will differ with the author, they will close it without a feeling of animosity."—*Newark Sunday Call*.

"It is a book that will awaken criticism, but that can safely court the criticism. The honesty of its purpose and the ability of its execution will be unquestioned. It will be profitable reading for those who agree and those who differ. Dr. Crowe's style is vigorous and direct; the book will prove a thought generator. The purpose of this series of lectures is 'to state the main principles of religious thought and feeling in America; denominations are introduced only as they are typical, leaving the author free to deal with those phases of the religious problem which are not institutionalized.' In carrying out this purpose Dr. Crowe has given us an outline of denominational positions that for clearness, frankness and fairness will be hard to excel.

There is no more valuable part of the book than the two chapters on the 'Problem' and the 'Method.' It is doubtful if there ever has been written a better argument against atheism."—*Philadelphia Correspondent of the Christian Leader*.

A ministerial friend writes: "I have gotten a year's preaching out of it."

"Our new world is the Old World, its languages and literatures, governments and religions—carried over and reproduced under new conditions. These were such as to make the time, in one sense, a possibly creative period; and such it was

and proved to be in modifications and adaptations to changed environments; but still, in the main, old ideas and forms, especially in religion, held their way; each seed producing after its kind.

It is in the clear perception and working out of this fact, and the wonderful and even dramatic power of its presentation, that the great value of Dr. Crowe's *Phases of Religion in America* is seen. It is not alone a history, but at the same time a philosophy of history, and it is only as history is thus read that its real and deeper meanings can be understood, and its educational, its teaching, power be realized.

*Phases of Religion in America* is a proper companion to Dr. Herford's *Story of Religion in England*; but the latter is not essential to the understanding of the former, for Dr. Crowe deals sufficiently with the sources to make plain their related results. His work is really a contribution to the history and literature of the religious thought and life of our country; not in the sense of new facts, for these are common; but in their grouping and interpretation, and the wisely placed emphasis of their essential contents and values. The conception, the style, the movement of the thought, is such that any thoughtful mind, reading the first lecture, will be carried on with increasing interest to the last; and then wish that there were more."—*Review of the book by H. W. Thomas, D.D., in To-Day.*

"Though brilliantly written and abounding in rhetorical climaxes and antitheses, which are in most hands eminently unfavorable to a candid presentation of facts, there is not a single palpable injustice, a single inflamed or over-wrought statement in the book. The writer's rare powers of humor, of satire, of sarcasm, are held in kindly leash, and thoroughly subordinated to the promptings of a noble heart and the decisions of a crystal mind. One feels, as these glowing pages storm his heart and his intellect, that the author does indeed 'plead that truth of religion which over-arches all sects, and that spiritual experience which underlies them all.'

The eleventh chapter ('The Problem—Is God Good?') is a powerful presentation of a difficult theme, and is itself worth ten times the price of the book. In connection with the twelfth chapter, ('The Method—How God Works') it is an irrefrag-

able reply to the pessimism of Schopenhauer and the shallow arraignments of Providence in the disjointed and phantasmal philosophy of Ingersoll.

*Phases of Religion in America* shows ripeness of scholarship, fulness of reading, maturity of judgment, carefulness of preparation and complete mastery of the subjects treated. The writer has strong convictions of his own, but they are mellowed by a broad and generous catholicity of temperament and culture, which enables him to take the position of the sect, party or movement he wishes to discuss."—*From a review by Jos. H. Foy, LL.D., in Non-Sectarian.*

" We know of no other single book in which the reader will find so much latter-day information concerning Methodism, Episcopalianism, Universalism, Unitarianism, Theism, Spiritualism, Ethical Culture, and the general considerations that would gather around such a study."—*Unity.*

## Phases of Religion in America.

BY W. S. CROWE, D.D.

144 pages, Cloth, One Dollar.

Address Rev. W. S. CROWE, Newark, N. J.





BS  
071



Deacidified using the Bookkeeper process.  
Neutralizing agent: Magnesium Oxide  
Treatment Date: June 2005

**Preservation Technologies**  
A WORLD LEADER IN PAPER PRESERVATION

111 Thomson Park Drive  
Cranberry Township, PA 16066  
(724) 779-2111



LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 014 327 709 4

